

*The Journal of Southern History*

VOLUME XV

AUGUST, 1949

NUMBER 3

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY PRESS

Copyright, 1949, by the Southern Historical Association

## CONTENTS

<i>A Critical Southerner: John C. Calhoun on the Revolutions of 1848.</i> By Charles M. Wiltse .....	299
<i>The Slavery Question in the Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest.</i> By Walter B. Posey .....	311
<i>Southern Literary Criticism and the Sectional Dilemma.</i> By Eugene Current-García .....	325
<i>Development of the Cotton Industry by the Five Civilized Tribes in Indian Territory.</i> By Gilbert C. Fite .....	342
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Philip Mazzei on American Political, Social, and Economic Problems. Edited and translated by Howard R. Marraro .....	354
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Schlesinger, <i>Paths to the Present</i> , by James Harvey Young .....	379
Knight, <i>A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860.</i> Vol. I, <i>European Inheritances</i> , by E. M. Coulter .....	381
Werline, <i>Problems of Church and State in Maryland During the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries</i> , by Aubrey C. Land .....	382
Clark, <i>Captain Dauntless: The Story of Nicholas Biddle of the Continental Navy</i> , by William E. Livezey .....	384
Wayland, <i>Andrew Stevenson: Democrat and Diplomat, 1785-1857</i> , by Francis P. Gaines, Jr. ....	386
Cuthbert, <i>Lincoln and the Baltimore Plot, 1861: From Pinkerton Records and Related Papers</i> , by Benjamin P. Thomas .....	388
Martin, <i>Florida's Flagler</i> , by Kathryn Abbey Hanna .....	389
Pratt, <i>Eleven Generals: Studies in American Command</i> , by Thomas Robson Hay .....	390
Bishop, <i>Lots of Land</i> , by Clinton Harvey Gardiner .....	393
Dobie, <i>The Voice of the Coyote</i> , by A. J. Hanna .....	394
Vance, Ivey, and Bond, <i>Exploring the South</i> , by H. C. Nixon .....	396
Selznick, <i>TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization</i> , by James W. Livingood .....	397
Fries and others, <i>Forsyth: A County on the March</i> , by Frontis W. Johnston ..	399
Hoffsommer, <i>Regional Research Cooperation</i> , by Homer L. Hitt .....	400
Hood, <i>Archibald Henderson: The New Crichton</i> , by William Pratt Dale, II ..	401
Warren, <i>Paraguay: An Informal History</i> , by Leon F. Sensabaugh .....	402
Thompson and Thompson, <i>Race and Region</i> , by Francis B. Simkins .....	403
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
The Annual Meeting .....	405
Personal .....	406
Historical Societies .....	410
Bibliographical .....	411
<i>Contributors</i> .....	419

## A Critical Southerner: John C. Calhoun on the Revolutions of 1848

BY CHARLES M. WILTSE

The revolutionary movement in Europe exploded at a time when the United States was deeply concerned both with foreign relations and with human freedom.<sup>1</sup> The war with Mexico was not yet officially over, but the restriction of slavery in the newly acquired territory already threatened to disrupt the Union. Anxious eyes were still turned toward England, whose claims to Oregon had barely been compromised short of war. The Panic of 1837 had left a heritage of social unrest that tended to merge with abolitionism and to find expression in political channels. The Mormons had created a temporal Utopia beyond the frontier, and Fourierist phalanxes still dotted the older states. In Rhode Island, where a disfranchised majority under the leadership of Thomas Wilson Dorr had set up its own constitution and elected its own slate of public officers, the spirit of egalitarianism even approached the pattern it was to follow in Paris.

The senior Senator from South Carolina looked on with the cold detachment of the student he was. When news of the French uprising reached Washington toward the end of March, 1848, John C. Calhoun was just sixty-six years old, and with the single exception of Daniel Webster was by all odds the best known figure still active in American public life. The enthusiastic nationalism of his first years in Congress and the bitterness of the nullification period were alike behind him. He was an elder statesman in the best sense of the word, venerated by some, admired by many, respected by all. In the breadth of his experi-

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, December 29, 1949.

ence and the scope of his intelligence not one among his contemporaries could match him, and his views on any question carried the added weight of personal prestige and political power.

No man observed the domestic or the foreign scene with closer attention or with sharper understanding. To Calhoun, they were one and the same; or rather they were related aspects of a world-wide canvas. Like the communist prophets he saw the masses struggling for control—the proletariat emerging to make its bid for power. But to him it was not the dawn of a new and nobler age. It was a threat to order, to stability, to civilization. He never questioned the propriety or the right of the gifted individual to rise from the laboring to the ruling class by virtue of his own talents and industry, but to reverse the classes themselves was anarchy and stupid folly. The very nature of man made necessary a periodic reform of government, but reform in Calhoun's view was slow and gradual change, to be effected by controlled and orderly processes.

Himself only three years out of the State Department, Calhoun knew personally or by repute the leading figures in the diplomatic world, and was well grounded in the politics and the economics of Europe. He had, too, a kind of private listening post on the scene of action in the person of his daughter, Anna Calhoun Clemson, whose thought processes were so like his own as to be almost an extension of his faculties. Thomas G. Clemson had been for the past four years United States chargé d'affaires in Brussels, an ideal spot from which to observe the tide of revolt as it slowly engulfed Europe. Just two weeks before news of the French *coup d'état* reached Washington, Calhoun had written to Mrs. Clemson: "I am not surprised, that the powers of Europe so much dread changes. They are right; because what are called reform[s], will lead to anarchy, revolution and finally to a worse state of things than now exists, through the most erroneous opinions now entertained both in Europe and this country by the . . . popular party, as to in wh[at] liberty consists, and by what means, it can be obtained and secured." "Their opinion of liberty," he added with reference to the recent upheaval in Rhode Island, "is, neither

more nor less, than Dorrism."<sup>2</sup> The allusion is significant, for it reveals Calhoun's deeply rooted conviction that only the educated, the intelligent, the well-to-do have any stake in the government. He amplified his meaning a fortnight later, after news of the revolution had been received. "France," he wrote pontifically, "is not prepared to become a Republic."<sup>3</sup>

There were those among Calhoun's Senate colleagues who did not share his skepticism. Without awaiting more detailed despatches from abroad, Senator William Allen, an Ohio Democrat, offered congratulatory resolutions on March 28, 1848. When they reached the floor two days later John P. Hale of New Hampshire, a Whig, moved an amendment congratulating the French people especially on having taken steps to abolish slavery in their colonies. A spirited debate followed, but Hale's amendment did not have the effect probably intended by its mover of making the French revolution itself an issue between North and South. Enough of such issues were already before Congress, and when Calhoun spoke a few minutes after Hale he ignored the sectional twist. He wished well to France and recognized the far-reaching implications of her action, but congratulations at that time would be in his eyes distinctly premature.

"The people of France have done much," he assured his fellow Senators. "They have made a mighty revolution. They have overthrown an old and powerful monarchy, and decreed the establishment of a republic. All this they have accomplished in a very short period, and without any extraordinary bloodshed or confusion. It is indeed calculated to excite our wonder, and, so far as the aim of the French people extends, our lively sympathy. But the time has not yet arrived for congratulation. . . . They have decreed a republic, but it remains for them to establish a republic. . . . If they shall prove themselves to be as wise in constructing a proper constitution, as they have proved

<sup>2</sup> Calhoun to Anna Calhoun Clemson, March 7, 1848, in J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun* (American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1899, Vol. II, Washington, 1900), 745.

<sup>3</sup> Calhoun to Thomas G. Clemson, March 22, 1848, *ibid.*, 746-47; Calhoun to James Edward Calhoun, March 23, 1848, in Calhoun Papers (Duke University).

themselves to be skillful in demolishing the old form of government—if they shall really form a constitution which shall on one hand guard against violence and anarchy, and on the other against oppression of the people, they will have achieved, indeed, a great work." Only then, however, would congratulations be in order, and grave difficulties still lay in the way. The South Carolina Senator expressed his hope that other powers would not interfere and that France would be allowed to work out her own salvation in her own way. "If she succeed," he added, "it will be an admonition to all Europe, that the time has arrived when they must agree to yield to liberty in a constitutional and stable form. Thrones will fade away, and freedom and republican institutions become the order of the day. If, on the contrary, standing aloof and avoiding all contest, France shall fail in this great undertaking, after a fair trial, without the interference of other Powers, it will do more to put down liberty under a republican form of government, than any other event which could occur."<sup>4</sup>

Calhoun then moved to lay Allen's resolutions on the table. He was immediately voted down by a margin of better than two to one, without clear relation either to party or to sectional lines, but his remarks formed the point of departure for the remainder of the debate. As soon as it was available he sent the report of the proceedings to Clemson, with a more pessimistic comment than he had offered in the Senate. "Thus far," he wrote on April 1, "the revolution in France exhibits to the inexperienced eye a fair prospect; but I see much to excite in me deep distrust as to the result. Indeed, I have no hope, that she will ever be able to establish any government deserving to be called a republick."<sup>5</sup>

The debate on Allen's resolutions was reopened by President James K. Polk's message of April 3, communicating official despatches from Paris. The American Minister, Richard Rush, had taken both the con-

<sup>4</sup> *Congressional Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 Sess., 568-69 (March 30, 1848); Richard K. Crallé (ed.), *The Works of John C. Calhoun* (6 vols., New York, 1853-1856), IV, 450-54.

<sup>5</sup> Calhoun to Clemson, April 1, 1848, in Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of Calhoun*, 747-48.

gratulations and the recognition of the new regime upon himself, and there was no alternative but to sustain him. An effort to substitute milder phrasing failed, and the resolutions, without the slavery reference, were unanimously passed by the Senate on April 6. Calhoun and most of those who had supported his earlier motion to table did not vote.<sup>6</sup>

It was characteristic of Calhoun that he should examine the events of this turbulent epoch without special reference to time or place, but as an incident in human progress; not as a chapter in the history of any nation or even of Europe, but rather as a case study to be fitted into a universal pattern. Revolution, to his conservative mind, was nothing to rejoice about, and might well be an unmixed evil. It depended altogether upon what kind of government was overthrown, what kind replaced it, and more important still, upon what ends were sought by the revolutionists.

In the course of almost forty years of prominence in public life Calhoun had developed a complete and integrated theory of the state which had only recently been committed to paper in definitive form. He was at that very time using such odd moments as he could snatch from his always crowded schedule in the preparation of a treatise on the government of the United States. Having set forth the principles, he was illustrating them with the particular instance. It was inevitable that he should weigh the changing governments abroad in the same scale.

The details of Calhoun's political philosophy need detain us only briefly. He believed that the natural and proper state of man was the social state. He believed that society could not exist without government. And he believed that the liberty of the individual, each according to his capacities, could be attained only within the ordered framework of the political state. Anarchy was therefore the worst of evils, for where there was no government there could be no liberty. Government, as Calhoun defined the term, was of two types only: limited and absolute. In the one the major interests of the society were so balanced,

<sup>6</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 Sess., 579-81 (April 3, 1848), 590-92 (April 6, 1848).

and power so distributed among them, that no single interest or combination could gain the upper hand. In the other power was concentrated at one level. He believed the abuse of power to be inherent in the nature of man, and consequently as much to be feared from a numerical majority as from a single individual. It could be prevented only by some form of federal structure which left in the hands of the parts sufficient power to resist the abuses of their common rulers.

The equality of men, on which Thomas Jefferson had rested the case for majority rule, found no place in Calhoun's system. No slaveholder could believe in equality, but it is hardly likely that Calhoun would have accepted the dogma even had he never owned a slave. In the physical, mental, and moral endowments of men he saw no semblance of equality. He simply did not believe that all men were fit to govern themselves, or even to further their own best interests. This natural inequality made class distinctions inevitable, and society was built upon them. In such a scheme of things slavery was but one method of organizing a laboring class. To strike at slavery in America or at serfdom in Europe was thus to strike at the class structure itself; and to give political power to free labor was equally to upset the forms of social order. To Calhoun the theories of Louis Blanc were as destructive as those of William Lloyd Garrison. Both would produce anarchy by destroying an accepted pattern without substituting a better pattern in its place. As early as 1828 when he wrote the *South Carolina Exposition* Calhoun had analyzed the economic basis of the class structure in terms that did not distinguish between slave and free labor, and in 1835 he had pointedly warned northern capitalists that their interests did not differ from those of the southern planters. In his report on incendiary publications he had written:

A very slight modification of the arguments used [by the abolitionists] against the institutions which sustain the property and security of the South would make them equally effectual against the institutions of the North. . . . It would be well for those interested to reflect whether there now exists, or ever has existed, a wealthy and civilized community in which one portion did not live on the labor of another; and whether the form in which slavery exists in the South is not but one modification of this universal condition. . . . It is



time to look these questions in the face. Let those who are interested remember that labor is the only source of wealth, and how small a portion of it, in all old and civilized countries, even the best governed, is left to those by whose labor wealth is created.<sup>7</sup>

The free worker controlled the product of his toil no more than did the slave. If one system was evil, so was the other. Louis Blanc and Karl Marx were prepared to say that both were evil; but to Calhoun that would be equivalent to saying that the great mass of mankind were as intelligent, as able, as devoted as the chosen few. It would be to fly in the face of all experience and would come perilously close to denying the providence of God.

The next mails from Europe brought news of a more substantial kind, and Calhoun determined to withhold publication of his own treatise on government until such time as he could more fully evaluate this new experience.<sup>8</sup> Yet his conviction remained unshaken that the weakness of the liberals both at home and abroad was their belief in majority rule. His sense of historical continuity was strong, and he could not believe that the conditions which had given birth to the greatest civilization the world had yet seen could be in the long run bad. If there were bars to further progress, they should be removed, but cautiously and with due care to preserve all that was good.<sup>9</sup>

So far as France was concerned his own views were echoed and enlarged in the first unofficial report he received from Anna Clemson: What you say of the erroneous ideas entertained as to what is true liberty, never was more clearly proved than by what is at present going on in France. One cannot judge with any certainty of the course events are taking, unless on the spot, for the friends praise too much, & the enemies blame too much, but from all I can put together, things are in a lamentable state & anarchy reigns for the moment. . . . I think the french too corrupt, & their ideas of a republic too wild, to have any confidence in the future. They say in France that they do not wish a republic as we have in America—that it is not *free enough* for them! . . . But even if I thought the french nation advanced, & virtuous enough, for a republic, & her political ideas on that subject feasible, Paris seems to me

<sup>7</sup> Crallé (ed.), *Works of Calhoun*, V, 207-208.

<sup>8</sup> Calhoun to James Edward Calhoun, April 15, 1848, in Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of Calhoun*, 749-50.

<sup>9</sup> Calhoun to Mrs. Clemson, April 28, 1848, *ibid.*, 752-53.

[an] insuperable difficulty. . . . *Paris is France*, & alone has made this revolution, and will always rule France, whatever may be the name of the government. It is to be hoped, however, that things may go better than I anticipate, for all agree that a republic in France is an inevitable experiment, & all desire to see it definitively established, even those who believe it will fail. It is also certain, (& there is the greatest evil,) that on the experiment France is making, depends the future government of Europe, & the more or less rapid advance of true liberty & I confess it pains me to see such power over the happiness of millions, confided to those I think so incapable of solving the great problems of government.<sup>10</sup>

With all this Calhoun agreed. He saw also a further hazard on the road to republican government in Europe, hardly less difficult to overcome than the egalitarian philosophy of the French people. The language in which he stated the case was strangely reminiscent of the financial battles of the Jackson era, perhaps the more pointedly so because it was to Andrew Jackson Donelson, then American Minister to Prussia, that he wrote:

So long as the present revolutionary governments shall continue the heavy burthens imposed by those they have overthrown—so long as they shall collect the present amount of revenue and continue the present extravagant disbursements, they will be exposed, not only to reaction, but convulsive movements, one after another, to be terminated in purely military governments. But great & difficult is the task of reducing taxes & disbursements. In old governments they cannot be reduced, to any great extent, without disturbing dangerously existing interests, & where there exist heavy debts & large military establishments, as is the case all over Europe, without coming into conflict with the two most powerful interests, the stockholders & the army.<sup>11</sup>

By May the old order was in eclipse in Italy, France, Germany, Austria. In England the Chartists made their bid for power, but timely reforms had already weakened the movement, and a few more concessions served to satisfy the rank and file. There was a certain ideological kinship between the conservative ruling class in Britain and the land-poor planters who ruled the southern states. Calhoun's remarks on Allen's resolutions were generally approved in England, and the South Carolina Senator rejoiced in turn at the failure of the Chartists.

<sup>10</sup> Mrs. Clemson to Calhoun, April 18, 1848, in Calhoun Papers (Clemson College).

<sup>11</sup> Calhoun to A. J. Donelson, May 23, 1848, in Andrew Jackson Donelson Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

To him it was the turning point for Europe, for it meant that a return to order and stability would be more quickly achieved, and it reduced thereby the danger that Russia would seize upon the confusion of the West to extend her own dominion over the Continent.<sup>12</sup>

It was no more than consistent with his political philosophy that Calhoun should regard England, with her relatively rigid class structure, as the chief bulwark of Europe; and it was also consistent that he should see in Germany alone any hope for creating a better government than that which had been overthrown. The existing federal organization in Germany seemed to offer a basis for the establishment of a political system more closely akin to that of the United States, and at the request of the Prussian Minister in Washington he went so far as to comment on the proposed German constitution. In the document he prepared, the constitutional history of his own country over the past twenty years served as the measure of his commentary.

"Every constitution, to succeed," he wrote late in May to Baron von Gerolt, "must be adapted to the community for which it is made, in all respects; and hence no one, in forming a constitution for itself, can derive much aid from that of others. With, then, the imperfect knowledge which I have, and which all must have, who have not long resided in the country, it seems to me, that the project errs in proposing to base the Constitution on *national unity* and to vest the union, or Empire, as it is called, with so vast an extent of power as it does." He could not imagine that the various German communities, and especially the more powerful states of Prussia and Austria, could be induced to adopt it, but even if it should prove acceptable, he doubted its wisdom.

A constitution based on national unity, and with such extreme powers, would, it seems to me, form too intimate and close a union, for a people divided into communities, with political institutions so very different and interests so very conflicting. The union would be much closer than that between the states of our union, and the powers possessed by the Empire would be much greater than those possessed by our federal government, although our State Governments are

<sup>12</sup> Calhoun to Clemson, May 13, 1848, in Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of Calhoun*, 754; Calhoun to James Edward Calhoun, May 22, 1848, *ibid.*, 755.

far more homogeneous than the several German communities and the diversity of interest much less. And yet, experience has shown, that the tendency to concentrate all powers in the federal government is far stronger than towards dissolution, contrary to the anticipation of many of the most experienced and wise of our statesmen, when the Government went into operation. Judged, then, by our experience, the constitution proposed for Germany, would end either in absorbing all the powers belonging to the Governments of the several communities and concentrat[ing] the whole in the Empire; or what is more probable, a conflict would occur between it and them, resulting from the Union being closer, than what interest and the sympathy of the parts would permit, which would end in the dissolution of the former.<sup>13</sup>

Calhoun's letter found its way to the Prussian foreign office, and word of its existence filtered down to the members of the constituent assembly then meeting in Frankfurt, but if any of them ever saw it, it was by grace of the American Minister rather than by any voluntary action on the part of the Prussian government.<sup>14</sup> Perhaps if Calhoun had known that his warning against the concentration of power in the central government would be quietly pigeonholed by the Prussian authorities, he would have been less optimistic for the future of Germany than he then was. For France his hopes were already gone, such few as he had ever entertained, before the end of May, and he forecast an ultimate return to an imperial government.<sup>15</sup>

Before Congress adjourned in the summer of 1848 the presidential campaign had begun to absorb Calhoun's attention. He gave less thought to Europe's problems and more to the impending disaster he so clearly foresaw at home. Yet the two remained intimately related in his thinking, and he took the first opportunity that offered to explain the connection in terms of his own carefully formulated theory of gov-

<sup>13</sup> Calhoun to Baron von Gerolt, May 28, 1848, in Merle E. Curti (ed.), "John C. Calhoun and the Unification of Germany," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895- ), XL (1934-1935), 477-78. His hopes for Germany were expressed many times in private correspondence. See especially Calhoun to Clemson, April 13, 1848, in Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of Calhoun*, 748-49; Calhoun to James Edward Calhoun, April 15, 1848, *ibid.*, 749-50; Calhoun to James Edward Calhoun, Jr., April 23, 1848, in *Calhoun Papers* (Duke University).

<sup>14</sup> Charles Graebe, acting United States Consul at Frankfurt, to Donelson, July 2, 1848, postscript dated July 3, in *Donelson Papers*.

<sup>15</sup> Calhoun to Clemson, May 26, 1848, in Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of Calhoun*, 756-57; Calhoun to Mrs. Clemson, June 23, 1848, *ibid.*, 757-59.

ernment. In his speech on the Oregon bill, June 27, 1848, his language is almost identical with that of the posthumous *Disquisition on Government*. "Instead . . . of liberty and equality being born with man . . . they are high prizes to be won . . . and when won, the most difficult to be preserved." The inherent freedom and equality of men so boldly proclaimed by the founding fathers Calhoun now pronounced to be "the most dangerous of all political errors . . . [which] has done more to retard the cause of liberty and civilization, . . . than all other causes combined. While it is powerful to pull down governments, it is still more powerful to prevent their construction on proper principles. It is the leading cause among those which have placed Europe in its present anarchical condition, and which mainly stands in the way of reconstructing good governments in the place of those which have been overthrown. . . . Nor are we exempt from its disorganizing effects. We now begin to experience the danger of admitting so great an error to have a place in the Declaration of Independence."<sup>16</sup>

Over the next few months the news from Europe tended to bear out Calhoun's predictions, if not his basis for them. Even Pennsylvania-born Richard Rush, whose personal and economic ties were all with the abolitionists, wrote from Paris that the more he saw of Europe the more he found to excuse in southern slavery; and Donelson in Berlin was ready to credit slavery with a major role in the creation of free institutions in America.<sup>17</sup> By the middle of 1849 government by force seemed fully restored over the Continent, and the upsurge of the masses at an end.<sup>18</sup>

The Clemsons were at home for a season in 1849, and before they returned to Brussels late in that year Anna had been indoctrinated anew in her father's philosophy. She too had glimpsed the restless

<sup>16</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 Sess., 876 (June 27, 1848), Appendix, 873 (June 27, 1848); Crallé (ed.), *Works of Calhoun*, IV, 511-12.

<sup>17</sup> Richard Rush to Calhoun, August 25, 1848, in Chauncey S. Boucher and Robert P. Brooks (eds.), "Correspondence Addressed to John C. Calhoun, 1837-1849," in *American Historical Association, Annual Report*, 1929 (one vol. and supplement, Washington, 1930), I, 469; Donelson to Calhoun, September 27, 1848, *ibid.*, 475-76.

<sup>18</sup> Clemson to Calhoun, August 1, 1849, *ibid.*, 520-21; Clemson to Calhoun, [September?] 1849, *ibid.*, 529.

shifting of the social equilibrium in her own country, and her inspection of Europe on her return was the sharper and perhaps the more pessimistic for what she had seen at home. When she wrote her impressions to her father in December it might have been Calhoun communing with himself. "There seems," she wrote, "a *pause*, in the current of events. This may be the pause before the tempest, or the indifference which succeeds over exertion, or hopelessness. Time alone can show what its true nature is. For my self I have not the slightest conception where all this is tending, but I fear it is the beginning of an epoch, more or less long, of debasement for the people, & tyranny of the leaders. . . . In short I fear so far revolution & agitation have rather injured than aided the cause of rational liberty. If our country fails under the present trying circumstances the future will be gloomy indeed to those who wish well to humanity."<sup>19</sup>

For Europe it was indeed indifference and hopelessness and the sheer impotence of the dispossessed. For America it was the prelude to Armageddon.

<sup>19</sup> Mrs. Clemson to Calhoun, December 22, 1849, in Calhoun Papers (Clemson College).

## The Slavery Question in the Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest

BY WALTER B. POSEY

Harriet Martineau, in one of the most scathing invectives against slavery, lashed the Presbyterian Church for its attitude toward the southern institution. She said that "from the lips and pens of Presbyterians in the south, come some of the defenses of slavery which evince the deepest depravity of principle and feeling. . . . Of the Presbyterian, as well as other clergy of the south, some are even planters, superintending the toils of their slaves, and making purchases, or effecting sales in the slave-markets, during the week, and preaching on Sundays whatever they can devise that is least contradictory to their daily practice."<sup>1</sup> Stephen S. Foster, in early life a student of divinity and later an active participant in the antislavery movement, charged that the Presbyterian clergy was "among the most active and energetic in arousing the people to determined and obstinate resistance. No sect in the land has done more to perpetuate slavery."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Benjamin M. Palmer, popular Presbyterian preacher in New Orleans, delivered on the eve of the Civil War a sermon, "The South: Her Peril and Her Duty," with the theme, "in this [slavery] struggle, we defend the cause of God and religion." James H. Thornwell, professor of didactic and polemic theology at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Columbia, South Carolina, declared in 1850, "Slavery is a part of the curse which sin has introduced into the world and stands in the same general relations to Christianity as poverty, sickness, disease, or death." A decade later he defended his interpretation: "We feel that

<sup>1</sup> Harriet Martineau, *Society in America* (3 vols., London, 1839), III, 230-31.

<sup>2</sup> Stephen S. Foster, *The Brotherhood of Thieves, or, A True Picture of the American Church and Clergy* (New London, Conn., 1843), 45.

the souls of our slaves are a solemn trust and we shall strive to present them faultless and complete before the presence of God."<sup>3</sup>

These opposing opinions are challenging and warrant the tracing of the slavery question in the Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest from the first formal action on the subject in 1787 until 1837 when the church divided into Old and New schools.<sup>4</sup>

In 1787 the first official resolution on slavery, adopted by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, recommended that its members "give those persons who are at present held in servitude such good education as to prepare them for the better enjoyment of freedom" and "use the most prudent measures, consistent with the interest and the state of civil society, . . . to procure eventually the final abolition of slavery in America."<sup>5</sup>

David Rice, generally accepted as the father of Presbyterianism in the West, assumed leadership of the opponents of slavery in early Kentucky. Rapidly acquiring a position of trust among the people, he was elected to the constitutional convention in May, 1792.<sup>6</sup> Before this body met, he published his convictions on the slavery issue in a pamphlet in which he urged the convention as its first duty to put an end to involuntary servitude in Kentucky.<sup>7</sup> Although Rice's proposal was not adopted, Kentucky sentiment against Negro bondage was still strong. In 1794 the Transylvania Presbytery,<sup>8</sup> embracing all of Kentucky, ordered Presbyterian slaveholders to teach all "not above the

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 214-15, 240.

<sup>4</sup> For a similar study of slavery in the Methodist Church, see Walter B. Posey, "Influence of Slavery upon the Methodist Church in the Early South and Southwest," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XVII (1930-1931), 530-42.

<sup>5</sup> *Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1841), 540.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Davidson, *History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky* (New York, 1847), 66-68; Robert H. Bishop, *An Outline of the History of the Church in the State of Kentucky, during a Period of Forty Years: Containing the Memoirs of Rev. David Rice* (Lexington, Ky., 1824), *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> David Rice, *Slavery, Inconsistent with Justice and Good Policy* (Philadelphia, 1792), 21.

<sup>8</sup> The four judicatories of the Presbyterian Church are general assembly, synod, presbytery, and session.



age of fifteen years to read the word of God & give them such good education as may prepare them for the enjoyment of freedom."<sup>9</sup>

The Transylvania Presbytery's action so disturbed the General Assembly of 1795 that a committee was appointed to draft a letter warning the presbytery "that differences of opinion with respect to holding Christian communion with those possessed of slaves, agitate the minds of some among you, and threaten divisions which may have the most ruinous tendency." Furthermore, the assembly stated that it had taken all steps "expedient or wise, to encourage emancipation, and to render the state of those who are in slavery as mild and tolerable as possible."<sup>10</sup> Apparently this rebuke failed to convince the Transylvania Presbytery that it had spoken too vehemently. In the next year it adopted another resolution "earnestly recommending" that Presbyterians "emancipate such of their slaves as they may think fit subjects of liberty" and prepare others for eventual freedom.<sup>11</sup> In 1797 extenuating circumstances had taken effect: this presbytery again discussed slavery, declaring it "a moral evil," but refused to consider all slaveowners guilty.<sup>12</sup>

To some people concerned over the problem of Negro servitude the church provided a solution that would be superior to any state law. In 1799 Rice wrote to James Blythe that he preferred to see Christians adopt "a rational plan for the gradual abolition of slavery: and do it under the influence of religion & conscience, without any regard to law . . . because then it would appear to be the genuine effect of the power of truth and the justice & benignity of the religion of Jesus."<sup>13</sup> But Rice later relinquished much of his buoyant and optimistic faith in

<sup>9</sup> "Extracts from the Minutes of the Transylvania Presbytery, 1786-1837," October 13, 1794, in William W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier: The Presbyterians 1783-1840* (New York, 1936), 147. Also see Thomas C. Pears (ed.), "First Formal History of Transylvania Presbytery," in *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* (Philadelphia, 1901- ), XIX (1940), 145-63.

<sup>10</sup> *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America from Its Organization A.D. 1789 to A.D. 1820 inclusive* (Philadelphia, c. 1835), 104 n.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted in Davidson, *Presbyterian Church in Kentucky*, 336.

<sup>12</sup> "Minutes of the Transylvania Presbytery, 1786-1837," October 5, 1797, in Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, 169-70.

<sup>13</sup> Rice to James Blythe, December 11, 1799, in Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia.

the unique position of the church. As he lay dying, he took a parting shot at a slaveholding society which withheld from its slaves "instruction and grace" and deprived them of liberty—the whole institution was "the crying sin of our country . . . now bleeding at a thousand veins."<sup>14</sup> Fearing for the personal safety of emancipated Negroes, Rice kept his slaves but hoped in time they would have greater security. He willed his daughter a Negro woman whose children were to be freed at age twenty-five for the males and twenty-three for the females. "Freedom is a natural and unalienable right," he wrote, "belonging to them, as well as others, of which the proprietor of man has not authorized me to deprive them."<sup>15</sup>

Other leaders in the church believed as Rice did about slavery. As early as 1793 James Blythe wrote in his journal: "I spoke to a number of poor black people. Their ignorance and inattention is so truly to be lamented. O God display thy arm and work powerfully in their behalf."<sup>16</sup> Barton W. Stone, while on a visit from his home in Kentucky to Charleston in 1797, received impressions of slavery that firmly fixed his distaste for the institution. He was sickened at the horrid sights, the worst that he had ever seen, and commented, "poor negroes! some chained to their work—some wearing iron collars . . . distress appeared scowling in every face." No longer a Presbyterian in 1828, he was preaching and writing that slavery was morally and politically wrong. In desperation to free himself from its immediate presence, he moved to Illinois in 1834.<sup>17</sup>

In 1818, two years after the death of Rice, the Presbyterian General Assembly approved the most rigorous legislation against slavery which it had passed for many years. It declared Negro bondage "a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature," and "totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ." After sympathizing with that portion of the church affected

<sup>14</sup> Bishop, *Outline of the Church in Kentucky*, 83.

<sup>15</sup> MS. (copy) David Rice's will, March 22, 1816, in Presbyterian Historical Society.

<sup>16</sup> MS. Journal of James Blythe, 1792-1793, *ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> John Rogers, *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself: with Additions and Reflections* (Cincinnati, 1847), 27-28, 79, 288-93.

by the evil, the resolution exhorted Presbyterians "to increase their exertions to effect a total abolition of slavery." The significance of this action was made ambiguous when the assembly reminded the churches that regard should be taken for "the safety and happiness of the master and the slave."<sup>18</sup> The church had taken a definitely exalted stand, but there was little evidence that the resolution would ever be enforced. Here was a compromise between the church's principles and the slavery forces that so thoroughly controlled sentiment in the Old Southwest.<sup>19</sup> "The effect of this temporizing and procrastinating policy," said William Goodell, "was precisely as might have been anticipated. The 'mournful evil' only struck its roots deeper under such pruning."<sup>20</sup>

There is evidence that the impending extension of slavery from Kentucky to Missouri prompted the declaration of 1818.<sup>21</sup> At this stage religious and secular arguments against the Missouri Compromise bill were based on "justice and duty and the law of Christ" in contrast to the "defense of slavery on principle."<sup>22</sup> The latter theme was soon to be advanced with the expansion of cotton culture and the rise of abolitionism.

During the first third of the nineteenth century cotton and slavery brought rapid changes to southern life and thought. Penniless immigrants became small freeholders, and native farmers often became planters. The mania to own slaves spread to the extent that James Smylie, a Presbyterian clergyman in Mississippi, claimed that three-fourths of all Presbyterian Church members in the South were slaveholders.<sup>23</sup> The force of expansion pushed the cotton frontier to the very edge of profitably productive lands. By 1833 the four states of Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana produced far more cotton

<sup>18</sup> *Minutes of the General Assembly, 1789-1820*, pp. 692-93.

<sup>19</sup> Albert Barnes, *The Church and Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1857), 54-66.

<sup>20</sup> William Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-Slavery* (New York, 1852), 152.

<sup>21</sup> Henry K. Rowe, *The History of Religion in the United States* (New York, 1924), 99-100.

<sup>22</sup> Leonard W. Bacon, *A History of American Christianity* (New York, 1921), 270.

<sup>23</sup> James Smylie, *Minority Report of a Committee of the General Association of Connecticut, on the Sin of Slavery* (Salisbury, Conn., c. 1849), 4. Carter G. Woodson, *The History of the Negro Church* (Washington, 1921), 97, believes there were less than twenty thousand Negroes in the Presbyterian Church at any time before the Civil War.

than the remainder of the country.<sup>24</sup> As cotton and slavery strengthened their grip on southern life, there came a halt to the growth of democracy and liberalism. This condition had been true in older states at earlier times;<sup>25</sup> in 1817 Robert Finley, Presbyterian minister and president of Franklin College, blamed money, cotton, and slavery for lack of religious zeal in Georgia. "Slavery chills every ardor," he asserted.<sup>26</sup>

Despite the humanitarian emphasis of the Presbyterian Church, records of the different judicatories are peculiarly lacking in cases of discipline or reprimand for violations of the Negro's accepted rights. A few cases, however, were recorded. In 1809 the Concord (Kentucky) Church suspended a member for selling a Negro boy at public auction. This decision was upheld by the Synod of Kentucky, which overruled a reversal by the Presbytery of West Lexington.<sup>27</sup> In 1823 John Curry was found guilty by the church of Paris, Kentucky, of selling a Negro man and thereby separating him from his family. Although the session felt "bound to lift their Testimony against the inhumane and unfeeling practice," finding extenuating circumstances it ruled that the case did not call for its "judicial interference."<sup>28</sup> William Thompson admitted in 1827 before the Pisgah (Mississippi) Church that he had cruelly whipped a slave but denied any intention of being "unmerciful." After an admonition, the session acquitted him.<sup>29</sup> These cases indicate the difficulty of securing convictions against a white member of the church; the breadth of permissible interpretation usually operated against the slave.

<sup>24</sup> Edward Channing, *A History of the United States* (7 vols., New York, 1907-1932), V, 409, 433.

<sup>25</sup> For South Carolina, see William A. Schaper, "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1900 (2 vols., Washington, 1901), I, 237-463.

<sup>26</sup> Isaac V. Brown, *Memoirs of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D.* (New Brunswick, 1819), 127-29.

<sup>27</sup> John Robinson, *The Testimony and Practice of the Presbyterian Church in Reference to American Slavery* (Cincinnati, 1852), 53; "Minutes of the Synod of Kentucky, 1802-1811," October 12, 1809, in Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, 378-79.

<sup>28</sup> MS. Record Book, Paris (Kentucky) Presbyterian Church, 1820-1824, pp. 89-90, in Kentucky State Historical Society, Frankfort, Kentucky.

<sup>29</sup> MS. Session Record, Pisgah (Mississippi) Presbyterian Church, 1823-1874, December 22, 1827, in Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, Montreat, North Carolina. This collection is hereafter cited as Montreat.

The American Colonization Society, established in Washington in 1817, had as its chief object the removal to Africa of Negroes who were already free and of others who might later be emancipated. State colonization societies were also formed.<sup>30</sup> Much interest in the movement was evinced by slaveholders who honestly sympathized with the Negro's plight and by others who hoped to rid the states of the undesirable free Negroes. Still others hoped colonization would eventually lead to emancipation of all slaves. Seven years after the founding of the Colonization Society, the Synod of Kentucky appointed committees to promote its work within the churches. Recommendations urging participation in and contribution to the enterprise were made from year to year.<sup>31</sup>

Records of the different judicatories of the Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest reveal considerable interest in colonization. In 1826 the Louisville (Kentucky) First Presbyterian Church gave \$25.25 for the program.<sup>32</sup> The New Providence (Kentucky) Church made contributions of \$11.25 in 1826, \$8.37½ in 1827, and \$14.50 in 1828.<sup>33</sup> A meeting of the North Alabama Presbytery in 1830 recommended that a collection for the Colonization Society be taken in the next July.<sup>34</sup> The Synod of West Tennessee in 1833 recognized the failure of the sessions to comply generally with its recommendation for a collection but urged that it be taken during July, 1834.<sup>35</sup> Two years later the New Orleans *Observer* sought to interest Presbyterians in the activity of the Mississippi Colonization Society, which had been authorized to purchase territory on the African coast.<sup>36</sup>

Only in Kentucky and Tennessee did the idea of emancipation of

<sup>30</sup> William H. Smith, *A Political History of Slavery* (2 vols., New York, 1903), I, 18-19. Also see Early L. Fox, *The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840* (Baltimore, 1919), *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> Davidson, *Presbyterian Church in Kentucky*, 337.

<sup>32</sup> MS. Record Book, Louisville First Presbyterian Church, 1819-1828, July 9, 1826, in Montreat.

<sup>33</sup> MS. Session Records, New Providence (Kentucky) Presbyterian Church, 1822-1849, October 1, 1826; July 1, 1827; July 21, 1828, *ibid*.

<sup>34</sup> MS. Minutes, North Alabama Presbytery, 1825-1844, October 8, 1830, *ibid*.

<sup>35</sup> MS. Minutes, Synod of West Tennessee, 1826-1849, October 18, 1833, *ibid*.

<sup>36</sup> New Orleans *Observer*, April 9, 1836.

slaves flourish in the Old Southwest. Antislavery workers appeared in East Tennessee with the coming of the first settlers and sought converts to their ideals. As late as 1827 that region contained nearly one-fifth of all the antislavery societies in the United States and almost one-sixth of the total membership. In the antislavery endeavor in Tennessee the early lead was taken by the Quakers, ably assisted by the Presbyterians.<sup>37</sup> The first religious newspaper in the Southwest was the *Western Luminary*, a Presbyterian journal capably edited by Thomas T. Skillman, in Lexington, Kentucky. From the establishment of this paper in 1823 until his death in 1833, Skillman fought slavery so courageously that William Lloyd Garrison praised him in the *Liberator*. The antislavery efforts of the *Western Luminary* and of two other Kentucky papers inspired Benjamin Lundy with "the hope that the day of political and moral redemption is drawing near."<sup>38</sup>

In 1832 and again in 1833 the antislavery members of the Synod of Kentucky introduced a resolution that "slavery, as it exists within our bounds, is a great moral evil, and inconsistent with the word of God, and we do, therefore, recommend to all our ministers and members who hold slaves . . . to favor all proper measures for gradual voluntary emancipation." Upon its tabling for the second year, Robert J. Breckinridge, one of the antislavery leaders in the synod, walked out of the house with the words, "God has left you, and I also will now leave you, and have no more correspondence with you."<sup>39</sup> About the same time he wrote for a church periodical that slavery was "utterly abhorrent from every law of God. . . . The man who cannot see that involuntary domestic slavery, as it exists among us, is founded on the principle of taking by force that which is another's has simply no moral sense."<sup>40</sup> Inertia likewise characterized church action in Tennessee. At the Synod of West Tennessee in 1833 the question was asked,

<sup>37</sup> For an excellent discussion of the antislavery efforts in Tennessee, see Asa E. Martin, "The Anti-Slavery Societies of Tennessee," in *Tennessee Historical Magazine* (Nashville, 1915-1937), I (1915), 261-81. For Kentucky, see Asa E. Martin, *The Anti-Slavery Movement in Kentucky prior to 1850* (Louisville, 1918), *passim*.

<sup>38</sup> Martin, *Anti-Slavery Movement in Kentucky*, 64, notes 3 and 4.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted *ibid.*, 84.

<sup>40</sup> Quoted in Bacon, *American Christianity*, 281-82, from *Biblical Repertory*, July, 1833.

"Is there any inconsistency under existing circumstances in professors of religion owning slaves?" After some discussion the topic was indefinitely postponed.<sup>41</sup>

Although there is little evidence that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church differed from the parent body to any extent on the slavery question,<sup>42</sup> its official organ, *Theological Medium*, maintained a strong opposition. In the issue of March 19, 1834, there was a ringing editorial on "Gradual Emancipation" declaring, "The hope that slavery will be perpetuated is a delusion—a desire that it should be is a disgrace upon humanity. The negro will be freed; and we *must* liberate him, or God will do it at our expense."<sup>43</sup> Finis Ewing, the only one of the three founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church who owned slaves, preached a sermon in Tennessee that was widely printed. In this he said, "Lest some of my readers say, 'physician heal thyself,' I think it proper to state in this place, that after a *long, painful*, and prayerful investigation of this subject, I have determined *not to hold*, nor to *give*, nor to *sell*, nor to *buy any slaves for life*."<sup>44</sup>

For many Presbyterian ministers slavery cast such a shadow over the South that they felt a strong urge to move away from the region. Among such preacher emigrés were Hugh Bass, stated clerk of the Synod of West Tennessee, who moved to Illinois, and James C. Barnes, stated clerk of the Transylvania Presbytery in Kentucky, who moved to Ohio. A Kentucky minister commented that the best men were "flying from the South."<sup>45</sup> Will Breckinridge, worried over the disposition of his own slaves and disgusted with slavery in Kentucky, wrote to a good friend in Ohio: "I care little where I go—so that I may only get where every man I see is as free as myself."<sup>46</sup>

<sup>41</sup> MS. Minutes, Synod of West Tennessee, 1826-1849, October 18, 1833, in Montreat.

<sup>42</sup> B. W. McDonnold, *History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church* (Nashville, 1888), 410.

<sup>43</sup> Quoted in J. Berrien Lindsley, "Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History," in *Theological Medium* (Nashville, 1845-1879), VII (1876), 11.

<sup>44</sup> Franceway R. Cossitt, *The Life and Times of Rev. Finis Ewing* (Louisville, 1853), 273.

<sup>45</sup> Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, 280, n. 36.

<sup>46</sup> Will Breckinridge to Sam D. Blythe, May 11, 1830, in Presbyterian Historical Society.

It is interesting to note that while some preachers left the South, others, shying from the fanatical efforts of abolition societies, became apologists for slavery. Joshua L. Wilson of Cincinnati in such a manner forsook his advocacy of emancipation.<sup>47</sup> There is much evidence to support Leonard Bacon's belief that the "southern apostacy" from the universally accepted sentiment on slavery may be dated from about 1833. At that time James Smylie, searching the Scripture to determine its teachings in regard to slavery, found to his surprise a marked variance from the popular notion.<sup>48</sup> Desiring to spread his discovery, Smylie delivered at Port Gibson, Mississippi, a sermon which "gave great offense" not only to the local church but also to the ministry, which cautioned him not to preach further along this line. In the meanwhile, the Chillicothe (Ohio) Presbytery addressed to the Mississippi Presbytery, of which Smylie was the stated clerk, a series of resolutions urging that the sin of slavery be forsaken. Irritated by the letter, Smylie was now determined to put his ideas and findings into printed form.<sup>49</sup> In an answer to the Ohio presbytery, he contended that Negro slavery was justified under Biblical dispositions and that the duties of masters and servants were clearly stated in the New Testament. He further pointed out that "servant" meant "slave" and that, if it were a sin to hold a slave, he demanded proof from the Holy Writ.<sup>50</sup> Although for a while Smylie "was covered with odium," his interpretation was so rapidly accepted that it became "not only prevalent, but violently and exclusively dominant" in most of the lower South.<sup>51</sup> In 1853 the Synod of Mississippi prepared a notice of Smylie's death; the committee acclaimed him for "giving the true exposition of the doctrines of the

<sup>47</sup> Raymond L. Hightower, "Joshua L. Wilson, Frontier Controversialist," in *Church History* (Chicago, 1932- ), III (1934), 314-15. For Wilson's views on slavery, see Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, 744-48.

<sup>48</sup> Bacon, *American Christianity*, 277-78.

<sup>49</sup> "Extract from the Minutes of the Synod of Mississippi," in *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, XXI (1943), 200-205.

<sup>50</sup> *A Review of a Letter, from the Presbytery of Chillicothe, to the Presbytery of Mississippi, on the Subject of Slavery* (Woodville, Miss., 1836), *passim*. Also see John G. Jones, *A Concise History of the Introduction of Protestantism into Mississippi and the Southwest* (St. Louis, 1866), 240-42.

<sup>51</sup> Bacon, *American Christianity*, 278.



Bible in relation to slavery in the commencement of the abolition excitement."<sup>52</sup>

The growing strength of abolition was terrifying to southern churches in the 1830's, and their fear contributed greatly to the surrender of important principles that formerly had been accepted by the higher judicatories.<sup>53</sup> From Tennessee to the Gulf, presbyteries and synods once silent on the slavery issue now united vigorously in a war against the abolitionists. In 1835 the South Alabama Presbytery resolved that "the Schemes and efforts of the Abolitionist[s] of the North are ruinous to the peace & happiness of our beloved country . . . , destructive to the comfort of the Slave population, the interest of the church and the Stability of established Institutions."<sup>54</sup> In the same year the committee on abolition of the Synod of West Tennessee reported that the emancipation movement was "disturbing its civil associations" and "alienating the affections of brethren."<sup>55</sup> Also in 1835 the Tuscaloosa (Alabama) Presbytery considered the abolitionist interference as "wicked and fanatical," "cruel and uncalled for," and, if continued, certain to "rend the union" and to lay "our country in ruins." Furthermore, it declared, slavery was so interwoven into the life of the South that it could not be suddenly abolished without great disaster.<sup>56</sup>

Although rigid opposition to slavery began to weaken in Kentucky about 1830, the Presbyterian Church there resisted slavery at least a decade longer than in any other southern state. Cotton was a far more important crop in Tennessee than in Kentucky; hence the churches in Tennessee had remained discreetly silent on the "peculiar institution." The antislavery element in Kentucky, however, had regained control of the Synod of Kentucky by 1835.<sup>57</sup> In a lengthy and able document a

<sup>52</sup> "Extract from the Minutes of the Synod of Mississippi," *loc. cit.*, 205.

<sup>53</sup> For the evolution of a philosophy of "positive good" in contrast to an earlier one of "necessary evil," see Arthur Y. Lloyd, *The Slavery Controversy, 1831-1860* (Chapel Hill, 1939).

<sup>54</sup> MS. Minutes, South Alabama Presbytery, 1835-1840, September 26, 1835, in *Montreat*.

<sup>55</sup> MS. Minutes, Synod of West Tennessee, 1826-1849, October 9, 1835, *ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> MS. Records, Tuscaloosa Presbytery, 1835-1843, October 2, 1835, *ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> For a series of resolutions on slavery presented to the Synod of Kentucky in 1834, see MS. (copy) Minutes, Synod of Kentucky, 1822-1845, October 11, 1834, *ibid.*

committee of ten presented a report which lucidly and fearlessly described the horrors of the slave system and recommended a plan for emancipation.<sup>58</sup> This was far in advance of the prevailing sentiment in the remainder of the South. Even in Kentucky it contributed to the disturbance of religious meetings of Negroes and to the closing of some of their Sabbath schools.<sup>59</sup> This statement generally expressed the view of the synod, but it was not acted upon because of the fanaticism that prevailed in the North at this time.<sup>60</sup> The plan, however, later was discussed by some of the presbyteries.<sup>61</sup>

A contrasting action was that of the Synod of Mississippi in 1835. In a resolution it denied that a church judicatory had the right to interfere in any of the political or civil relations of society, and confined church authority to the realm of conscience.<sup>62</sup> Two years later the South Alabama Presbytery took similar action. Its commissioners to the General Assembly were instructed that this body had no right to interfere with slavery matters and that they should seek to prevent any action on the subject.<sup>63</sup>

In 1836 twelve memorials on the subject of slavery were brought before the General Assembly.<sup>64</sup> A special committee on slavery reported that Negro bondage "is inseparably connected with and regulated by the laws of many of the states in this Union, with which it is by no means proper for an ecclesiastical judicatory to interfere." A vigorous minority report, however, held that "buying, selling, or holding a human being as property, is, in the sight of God, a heinous sin."<sup>65</sup> Immediately forty-eight slaveholding delegates met and agreed that

<sup>58</sup> *Address on Slavery* (Newburyport, Mass., c. 1836). The chief features of the report are found in Louisville *Western Presbyterian Herald*, May 26, 1836.

<sup>59</sup> Davidson, *Presbyterian Church in Kentucky*, 340-41.

<sup>60</sup> Robinson, *Testimony and Practice*, 54-62.

<sup>61</sup> For the action of the Transylvania Presbytery, see "Minutes of the Transylvania Presbytery, 1786-1837," April 2, 1836, in Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, 278.

<sup>62</sup> *New Orleans Observer*, December 12, 1835.

<sup>63</sup> MS. Minutes, South Alabama Presbytery, 1835-1840, April 10, 1837, in Montreat. For a similar resolution, see *Synod of South Carolina and Georgia on the State of the Church* (n. p., c. 1836), 4.

<sup>64</sup> *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church . . . 1836* (Philadelphia, 1836), *passim*.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 247-48, 250.

they would not submit to the acceptance of this or a similar report.<sup>66</sup> By vote of 154 to 87 the matter was closed by the adoption of a resolution indefinitely postponing action.<sup>67</sup>

In 1836 the majority in the General Assembly had been composed of New School representatives, but in 1837 the situation was reversed and the Old School delegation was safely in control. In this year the Presbyterian Church suffered internal division, the first among the important churches in the United States. The trouble resulted largely from the Plan of Union of 1801 between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists by which they were to co-operate in establishing churches and furthering missionary endeavors.<sup>68</sup> By a vote of 143 to 110 the plan was abrogated, followed by an excising of the four synods of Western Reserve, Geneva, Utica, and Genesee.<sup>69</sup> In the latter action, the majority reflected the view that there was no mode of removing trouble except to cut off those synods where the majority of churches were Congregational rather than Presbyterian.<sup>70</sup> When the separation was completed, about four-ninths of the Presbyterian clergymen and laymen, chiefly in the North, went into the New School. The Old School portion, however, still contained many antislavery men.<sup>71</sup>

Slavery did not enter into the discussion of issues in the assembly of 1837, but it was a latent force drawing the line of cleavage sharper and clearer. Many who so strenuously and plainly had condemned the acts of excising were leaders in the repudiation and condemnation of

<sup>66</sup> Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, 154.

<sup>67</sup> *Minutes of the General Assembly, 1836*, pp. 272-73.

<sup>68</sup> For explanations of this division, see Ezra H. Gillett, *History of the Presbyterian Church* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1864), II, Chaps. 40-43; Sweet, *The Presbyterians*, Chap. 5; Henry Woods, *The History of the Presbyterian Controversy* (Louisville, 1843); Zebulon Crocker, *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church in 1837* (New Haven, 1838).

<sup>69</sup> *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church . . . 1837* (Philadelphia, 1837), 421-22, 439-40, 444-45.

<sup>70</sup> Jacob H. Patton, *A Popular History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (New York, 1900), 437-39. Thomas C. Johnson, an excellent historian of Presbyterianism, believes that the Old School was the victor "only by virtue of an almost 'solid South'." "History of the Southern Presbyterian Church," in *American Church History Series* (13 vols., New York, 1893-1897), XI, 359.

<sup>71</sup> In general Presbyterians in the slave states belonged to the Old School. Even in Kentucky slavery was a vital force in encouraging most of the Presbyterians in the state to adhere to the Old School.

antislavery legislation.<sup>72</sup> Amidst some rejoicing, especially in the South, the action of the assembly led to a schism—each part of the church retaining the same name, the same standard, and almost the same field of activity.<sup>73</sup>

Despite the fact that the national antislavery movement began among the Presbyterians,<sup>74</sup> they, like the Methodists and Baptists, receded from an earlier position of attacking slavery and compromised with it. As cotton and slavery took a firmer hold on southern society and economy, Presbyterian orthodoxy became an important factor in establishing a "social oligarchy" whose convictions on the justice of the adopted position seldom wavered. Presbyterian clergymen, recognizing in Calvinistic theology the rational premise of master and slave, were among the ablest defenders of the moral and scriptural basis for slavery.<sup>75</sup> In accord with expediency,<sup>76</sup> the Presbyterian Church, "the most influential religious body in the United States,"<sup>77</sup> took its stand with an expanding slavocracy. Expediency produced compromise; compromise gave energy and stimulation to an institution, which, without the direct and indirect support of the churches in the early South and Southwest, might have been short-lived.<sup>78</sup>

As with similar topics in southern history, the general outline is familiar, a retelling of the old theme—cotton and slavery, expediency and compromise.

<sup>72</sup> Gillett, *Presbyterian Church*, II, 526. For others who support the emphasis on slavery, see Edward D. Morris, *The Presbyterian Church: New School, 1837-1867* (Columbus, Ohio, 1905), 59-61; James H. Johnston, *A Ministry of Forty Years in Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1865), 18-19.

<sup>73</sup> When a proslavery element in the New School formed the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in 1857, the New School virtually disappeared in the South.

<sup>74</sup> Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844* (New York, 1933), 94.

<sup>75</sup> See "The Moral Philosophy of Slavery," in Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought*, 200-41.

<sup>76</sup> Note the position of Dr. N. L. Rice, the "fencewalker," whose famous report to the General Assembly in 1845 served largely as the standard of the church until the Civil War. William W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America* (New York, 1930), 442-43.

<sup>77</sup> Bacon, *American Christianity*, 292.

<sup>78</sup> On this point, see Henry Wilson, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (3 vols., Boston, 1877), III, 697-724; Robert L. Stanton, *The Church and the Rebellion* (New York, 1864), *passim*.

## Southern Literary Criticism and the Sectional Dilemma

BY EUGENE CURRENT-GARCÍA

The gradual change of loyalty from national to sectional ideals which characterized the thinking of many Southerners in the decades before the Civil War presents a fascinating problem to literary and historical scholars. William Gilmore Simms, for example, despite "a strong sense of Americanism in literature," gradually shed his former enthusiasm both for the whole people and for a national American literature based on democratic creeds. By 1850 he was a defender of slavery and a devotee of "the realization of a united and independent southern republic" with a culture of its own based on an antidemocratic rejection of majority rule.<sup>1</sup> The pattern of Simms' shift might be applied with but slight modification to many southern writers.<sup>2</sup> But to suggest that such a change in attitude was due primarily, even in Simms' case, to personal or economic motives is to overlook others equally as significant in the development of southern nationalism in literature.

Simms' change of allegiance from national to southern ideals represented no fundamental shift in literary theory. It seems evident that the later plea for an independent sectional literature was but a special application of the earlier contention for independent American forms. Both expressed a desire to escape cultural domination. To avoid becoming and remaining a mere province of the North, the South must

<sup>1</sup> John W. Higham, "The Changing Loyalties of William Gilmore Simms," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935- ), IX (1943), 210-14.

<sup>2</sup> J. B. Hubbell, "Literary Nationalism in the Old South," in Duke University Americana Club, *American Studies in Honor of William Kenneth Boyd* (Durham, 1940), 175-220.

develop a distinctive literary culture of its own.<sup>3</sup> Such was the conviction of many southern intellectuals. This idea was no eleventh-hour inspiration on Simms' part; since the beginning of his career as editor of southern periodicals he had been clamoring for a southern literature.<sup>4</sup> Other writers, too, ever since the beginnings of national cultural awareness following the War of 1812, had been stressing, with varying degrees of urgency, the need for distinctive sectional modes of expression.<sup>5</sup> In literary matters the idea of sectionalism was closely bound up with that of nationalism. It had long been felt that the nation's area was too great and its social elements too diverse to be expressed in any single, homogeneous literary pattern.

One gets closer to the problem faced by southern critics on the eve of the Civil War if, instead of thinking of their attitude toward American literature in terms of changing loyalties, one regards it as the product of a divided mind in which the halves had never been wholly reconciled to each other. Simms again is a case in point. Commenting in 1845 on the material in his own stories, he wrote: "It is local, sectional—and to be *national* in literature, one must needs be sectional. No one mind can fully or fairly illustrate the characteristics of a great country; and he who shall depict *one section* faithfully, has made his proper and sufficient contribution to the great work of *national* illustration."<sup>6</sup> In almost identical words the same idea was endorsed by a New York reviewer of Simms' work several years later.<sup>7</sup> As long as sectionalism and nationalism could thus be accepted as complementary

<sup>3</sup> Raymond C. Palmer, "The Prose Fiction Theories of William Gilmore Simms" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Indiana, 1946), 93-95.

<sup>4</sup> W. S. Hoole, "William Gilmore Simms's Career as Editor," in *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (Savannah, 1917- ), XIX (1935), 47-54.

<sup>5</sup> Critics on the frontier had been agitating for a western literary culture as early as the 1820's. See R. L. Rusk, *The Literature of the Middle Western Frontier* (2 vols., New York, 1925), I, 273; David Donald and Frederick A. Palmer, "Toward a Western Literature, 1820-1860," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XXXV (1948-1949), 413-28.

<sup>6</sup> W. G. Simms, *The Wigwam and the Cabin* (New York, 1856), iv.

<sup>7</sup> *Literary World* (New York, 1847-1853), II (1847), 282. Simms' work, he wrote, was "truly American in subject, and even sectional, which in an American writer of fiction is undoubtedly a merit. For in our extended country, it would be next to impossible for a writer to identify himself with the individualities of the different quarters."

halves of one's being, there could be a sense of joint loyalty. New England, said Nathaniel Hawthorne in similar vein, was "as large a lump of earth" as his heart could contain; and he doubtless felt as strongly as Simms that in depicting his section faithfully he too was making his "proper and sufficient contribution" to the cause of American literature.

But as the two ideals of sectionalism and nationalism separated, each subtly changing its character in the process, a point would be reached eventually where the southern critic especially would have to make a choice. The problem cannot be presented adequately without seeing the causes as well as the effects of this diverging process.

Since before the turn of the century nationalism in literature had been one of the most perplexing questions with which critics had to deal. Beginning with the Connecticut Wits, discussions of the problem were carried on steadily by serious writers throughout the 1820's and 1830's, till at last "a national literature" became a cliché in the 1840's and 1850's.<sup>8</sup> Among the earlier critics engaged in an anxious search for the materials of an American literature, there were those who held that the new nation had no suitable materials and those who argued that it had plenty.<sup>9</sup> Both views were still common in the 1840's, but in place of the older academic attitudes there now began to appear a variety of more aggressively analytical views. The shift coincided with and was perhaps largely inspired by the social upheaval that paralleled the rise of Jacksonian democracy.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> In 1846 a critic in the *Democratic Review* casually observed that the question of whether there was or ever would be an American literature had been bandied about so long that it had worn thin. "Miss Fuller's Papers on Literature and Art," in *United States Democratic Review* (New York, 1838-1859), XIX (1846), 199. A few years later the same journal, deriding the literary policies of magazines like *Graham's* and *Godey's*, compared their treatment of the question to "such lively themes as the value of Hope [and] the worthlessness of Money." "Parlor Periodicals," *ibid.*, XXX (1852), 78. Such a blasé attitude as this, however, could come only after a long period of serious, and still unresolved, discussion of the possibilities of establishing a distinctive American literature.

<sup>9</sup> William E. Sedgwick, "The Problem of American Literature as Seen by the Critics, 1815-1830" (2 vols., Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1933), II, 416-50.

<sup>10</sup> The former period, dominated by a Federalist-Jeffersonian point of view, could treat the question of a national literature as a problem remote from the masses, but the coming to power of the Jacksonian "mob" brought with it a new set of realities. After

Debates still raged over the possibilities of achieving a national literature, but instead of centering upon the question of whether the nation possessed suitable materials for its development, they were drawing attention to the treatment of those materials and to the capacities and shortcomings of individual writers.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the basic assumptions underlying these debates were shifting. Implicit in the new doctrines of individualism and self-reliance vigorously set forth by Ralph Waldo Emerson and echoed by his transcendentalist disciples was the growing assumption that these ideas necessarily expressed the American mind as a whole. With equal vigor and scarcely less patriotic fervor, however, Edgar Allen Poe and Simms again and again encouraged southern writers to express their way of life and thus to challenge the assumption of a literary dictatorship in the Northeast.

The continuing liveliness of these controversies in the 1840's reflected the growing complexity of the problem of nationalism in American literature. In 1849 critics could still argue that the literary emancipation of the nation was only beginning and that Americans had not yet shaken off the domination of English habits, thought, and modes of expression in all branches of literature, including school texts.<sup>12</sup> The inability to evaluate truly national characteristics when they were present and to avoid slavish imitation was implied in the critical reception accorded such works as Rufus W. Griswold's antholo-

1830 the destiny of American literary expression could no longer be regarded as the sole prerogative of "gentlemen," whether Federalist or Jeffersonian by inclination, as the "mob" quickly demonstrated an aggressive determination to express its own views through representatives who proved quite capable of holding their own in intellectual skirmishing. The resulting conflict, in literature as in politics and religion, produced a general quickening of critical activity. See A. M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1945), 306-21, 369-90.

<sup>11</sup> When Margaret Fuller dared to question the values of Longfellow's and Lowell's poetry, she invited a shower of critical brickbats; but her criticism was also defended by others who saw in it an honest effort to substitute a genuine national literature for the shoddy and imitative varieties still prevailing. She was said to have opened "a new era of candor and plain speaking on a subject which has certainly had more than its fair share of nonsense and impertinence." "Miss Fuller's Papers on Literature and Art," *loc. cit.*, 198. Her criticism of the two foremost New England poets was vigorously attacked by Rufus Griswold in his *Prose Writers of America* (Philadelphia, 1847) and by Poe in "Notices of New Works," in *Southern Literary Messenger* (Richmond, 1834-1864), XV (1849), 190.

<sup>12</sup> "Cooper's Works," in *Democratic Review*, XXV (1849), 51-52.



gies of American poetry and prose.<sup>13</sup> But this was not the only significant implication. When southern reviewers examined these anthologies they were disturbed by the disproportionate space devoted in them to northern writers. The exclusion of many of their own authors led them to wonder why Southerners were not being considered representative American men of letters.<sup>14</sup> It was clear, therefore, that as late as mid-century few serious critics believed that adequate definitions of nationalism and of a national literature had yet been formulated.

At the root of the problem of nationalism in American literature lay a whole tangle of irreconcilable realities—economic, social, and political—any one of which would have been enough to retard the growth of a unified national culture capable of producing a distinctive national literature. Combined, they produced instead a confused state of mind which led many serious writers into a fruitless effort to reconcile through literature the opposing drives of a tough, practical materialism and an idealistic cast of thought. Most critics, however, could not bring themselves to admit the irreconcilability. Hence one way out of their dilemma was to predict the inevitable birth of a glorious national literature—in the not too distant future.

Even among southern critics examples of this belief in the ultimate union between materialistic ambitions and an idealistic national self-expression in literature may be found scattered throughout their periodicals up to the late 1840's.<sup>15</sup> Underlying the southern belief, however, was the traditional old-world view of literature as a special prerogative of the few, an expression of the leisured, highly cultured aristocracy, whereas the northern faith in the future greatness of American writings was drifting inexorably in the direction of Walt Whitman's completely egalitarian ideal. Not until the 1850's did Southerners begin fully to realize that their concepts of nationalism in literature were unalterably opposed to those of their northern colleagues. Then they

<sup>13</sup> "The Prose Writers of America," *ibid.*, XX (1847), 384-86; *Literary World*, I (1847), 61.

<sup>14</sup> *Southern Literary Messenger*, XIII (1847), 209-14, 320, 381-83.

<sup>15</sup> "American Poetry," *ibid.*, VIII (1843), 673-76; "Notices of New Works," *ibid.*, XI (1845), 62; "American Literature," *ibid.*, 393-400; *ibid.*, XIII (1847), 320, 381-83.

discovered that the democratic ideal, which had long served as a base upon which a national form of expression was to be built, no longer implied the same fundamental aims and purposes as it had in the leisurely days of Jefferson when an aristocracy of intellectual worth was not thought inconsistent with democratic practice. Their characteristic reaction to the discovery was the feeling that within recent decades society even in the South had deteriorated:

. . . we have become gradually *Americanized*. The earnest pursuit of money . . . for the mere vulgar ambition of being known as a "rich man," while the culture which can alone make life enjoyable is altogether neglected; the great informing spirit of the country has at last fixed its pitiless talons in us. The Puritanical spirit which dictated the blue laws, and which infused itself into the civilization of New England, has spread in time (with her wooden clocks) to the region once granted by Charles II to his courtly favorites.<sup>16</sup>

To the southern critic of the 1850's this gradual spread of a bourgeois spirit, significantly labeled *Americanizing* and scornfully associated with Yankee egalitarianism, had rendered the tone of American society as a whole grim, staid, falsely pious, and avaricious. In his view it was not surprising that such social deterioration had left its mark upon American literature, making it pallid, sentimental, and hypocritical. Convinced that Americans of his day were following false gods, the southern critic could only sneer at "this Chartist and Agrarian age, which looks less at the grand structures which its civilization is rearing, than at the soiled jackets and unwashed faces of the provokingly contented laborers; and would almost arrest the work . . . while it sheds sentimental tears over the blistered hand of the unconscious hod-man."<sup>17</sup> Yet, ironically, the realistic southern tory, no less than the most idealistic of his northern or western countrymen, could not agree that America lacked suitable materials for a national literature, if only her writers would raise their eyes to see them. What about the beauties of one's own section? What about "inspiration" as a source of great thoughts? he asked. The Divine Idea or Ideal Beauty was no less adequate a source of great art for the southern romantic than for the New

<sup>16</sup> "American Literature and Charleston Society," in *Southern Quarterly Review* (New Orleans, 1842-1857), XXIII (1853), 406.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 401.

England transcendentalist, but the difference lay in their methods of approaching and evoking it, and those methods sprang from irreconcilable elements within the national character.

Since the critics could not define the national character, they could not agree on the kinds of literature—either the substance or the forms—that would express it. Outsiders like Alexis de Tocqueville or Charles Dickens could see that almost the only indigenous literature truly expressive of an American character was to be found in the newspapers and comic ephemera of the time.<sup>18</sup> The swagger and the cynicism, the recklessness and arrogance of James Gordon Bennett's *Herald*<sup>19</sup> and the roistering yarnspinners in William T. Porter's *Spirit of the Times*,<sup>20</sup> were the nearest uniform approach to an expression of the American character. But outside the realm of journalism such realistic treatment of the American scene was not to be tolerated by a genteel society which was still too keenly aware of its crudities and foibles to live with them easily or to appreciate their pungent flavor in its own literature.<sup>21</sup> Especially in the South critics often overlooked the importance of indigenous qualities which were abundantly present in the works of some of their own unheralded writers.<sup>22</sup> Southerners had within their grasp the materials and techniques for a distinctive contribution to native American literature. The South's writers, more than any others, were developing a native comic tradition which enjoyed nation-wide popularity on the subliterary level of the newspaper, though it received scant attention or encouragement in the more formal literary journals. On the contrary, the earthy expressions, the colorful vulgarisms and metaphors, that sparkled in the pages of Augustus

<sup>18</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (2 vols., New York, 1839), II, 540-41. See also Charles Dickens, *American Notes* (New York, 1842).

<sup>19</sup> Allan Nevins, *American Press Opinion* (Boston, [1928]), 109-12.

<sup>20</sup> Walter Blair, *Native American Humor* (New York, [1931]), 82-86.

<sup>21</sup> See John Neal's essay on "Newspapers" in Lowell's *Pioneer* (Boston, 1843), I (1843), 61-65. Neal's opinion that contemporary newspapers were too numerous, shoddy, and worthless can be found reiterated in virtually every periodical essay on the subject during the 1830's and 1840's.

<sup>22</sup> Blair points out, for example, that although genteel Southerners might chuckle over the racy characterizations in Hooper's Alabama yarns, they tended to look down their noses at him for devoting his talents to such inelegant artistry. *Native American Humor*, 108-109.

Baldwin Longstreet, Johnson J. Hooper, George W. Harris, and Thomas B. Thorpe were thought to be dangerous if granted the dignity of formal critical recognition or of philological study in such a work as John Russell Bartlett's *Dictionary of Americanisms*. It was bad enough to have the idiom spoken by "low characters" in these yarns and tall tales, but "the bare preservation of such vulgarisms, in the form of a Glossary, will tend to increase their use. In this way they will emerge from colloquial service into the purposes of composition and our literature, debased by vile thoughts and disfigured by unworthy expressions, will display in choice profusion those exotics of rhetoric, which flourish in the genial soil of Cockiagne."<sup>23</sup>

Since the mundane thoughts, actions, and manners of the masses were ruled out, along with their more vigorous language, as being too low for literary consideration, those writers who believed that the springs of nationalism in art were to be found only in an appropriately lofty treatment of the sectional scene were obliged to romanticize the aspirations and ideals of the social and cultural leaders of their respective sections. But unfortunately the aims and ideals of one section clashed violently with those of another, and a parochial spirit often kept even the foremost writers from rising above the prejudices of their environment. Few critics could transcend the aims of their own local cliques; few could appreciate the efforts of those in other sections, let alone attain a national or universal point of view. Simms, for example, was smugly damned in the *North American Review* as "a writer of great pretensions and some local reputation," whose "extravagant, commonplace, disagreeable tales of vulgar villainy" betrayed an extreme degree of coarseness and lack of taste, and whose critical opinions were even worse because they breathed "an extravagant nationality, equally at war with good taste and generous progress in liberal culture."<sup>24</sup>

This was but one of many instances of Yankee pretentiousness which critics elsewhere resented. The idea that excellence in literature is ab-

<sup>23</sup> "Americanisms," in *Southern Literary Messenger*, XIV (1845), 628.

<sup>24</sup> "Simms's *Stories and Reviews*," in *North American Review* (Boston, 1815-1940), LXIII (1846), 357, 372, 376.

solite, not relative to local or sectional standards, was admirable, agreed the *Southern Literary Messenger* on another similar occasion, but "For years past, a *coterie* of very amiable and highly cultivated gentlemen, living within cry of Harvard University, have been engaged in the innocent occupation of puffing each other, every three months, in the *North American Review*, varying the monotony of these pleasant labours with an occasional 'snub' of the literary pretensions of some other less-enlightened quarter of the country."<sup>25</sup> For twenty years southern and western critics had been resentful of the eastern assumption of an all-inclusive literary superiority. Although Boston and New York periodicals sometimes published and praised articles by Westerners and Southerners, cried another, they rarely gave credit openly to these writers, but reserved explicit praise only for the members of their own cliques.<sup>26</sup> The *Messenger* summed up its typically southern grievance by saying, "we do scorn that narrow-mindedness which regards Philadelphia, New York, or Boston as America."<sup>27</sup>

At the same time that such critical insularity was being deplored on all sides as one of the major barriers against achieving the goal of a genuine national literature, it was also believed by many that the only way toward that goal lay along the path of sectional treatment. Some even looked forward anxiously to the time "when every State, as well as each section of the Union, will have found its peculiar painter and historian."<sup>28</sup> Hence this urgent desire for distinctive sectional cultures sharply focuses the conflict between sectional and national aspirations, though in it can be seen both the similarities and the differences in sectional aims. Southerners were seeking some of the same ends as Northerners and Westerners: a set of symbols and a literary idiom

<sup>25</sup> "Editor's Table," in *Southern Literary Messenger*, XVIII (1852), 756.

<sup>26</sup> "Poetical Literature of the West," *ibid.*, VII (1841), 440; *Western Monthly Review* (Cincinnati, 1827-1830), II (1828), 21, 56.

<sup>27</sup> *Southern Literary Messenger*, XIII (1847), 320. The *Messenger* argued that the pretended nationalism of the *North American Review* was in reality sheer parochialism: "They represent the New Englandism of American writers, the provincial and parochial character, aim, and tendency . . . of the intellectual Unitarian sect." At the same time, however, the *Messenger* also sensed a like assumption and presumption in the criticism of the *New York Literary World*, which seemed "to intimate, 'this alone is independent': 'this only is American.'"

<sup>28</sup> *Literary World*, II (1847), 282.

which might truly express the essence of American life as they knew and lived it. But hedged about by the traditions and inhibitions which characterized each group, the differences in their approach to the problem proved insoluble, and the motives of others looked suspicious.

Thus, when Emerson's work was praised in *Blackwood's Magazine* for "breathing the true spirit of American democracy and expressing it in the noblest of abstract language," such approval rankled in the hearts of loyal Southerners, one of whom indited a burning jeremiad against Emerson's work and all it stood for.<sup>29</sup> Denying that it could be seriously regarded as representative American literature, the writer sought to correct the misunderstanding of foreigners concerning the definition of that term.

We are at best no great admirer of that often heard phrase, *American Literature*. What does it mean? Does not all expression of human thought in an artistic manner . . . depend on the individual circumstances of a writer more than on his political condition? Climate, scenery, personal dependence or independence, joyousness or gloom, these have certainly much to do with the utterance of thought in written words. . . . By American literature our countrymen . . . probably mean . . . a literature which shall hallow the localities of our land, and throw the charm of genius around the spots where the ashes of our fathers sleep. A native literature ought to do for Massachusetts, or for Virginia, or for Louisiana, what Burns and Walter Scott have done for Scotland. . . . Writers who would do this for the American States, hallowing the country and producing a love of the local soil in the bosoms of the people, and stopping the tide of restless, roving emigration, ever thirsting for new scenes, and new lands, and new skies, would do what is worthy to be done, and would deserve the name of native literature.<sup>30</sup>

Clearly implicit in this "state-rights" rejection of Emerson's doctrines was the fear of revolutionary tendencies sensed in the egalitarian idealism of the transcendentalists, whom the writer, like many other southern critics, regarded as dangerous visionaries infected with the corrupt dreams of the German philosophers.<sup>31</sup> Rather explicit was the deep-rooted, traditional southern love of the soil, unalterably op-

<sup>29</sup> "Ralph Waldo Emerson—History," in *Southern Literary Messenger*, XVIII (1852), 247-55.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 247-48.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 253.

posed to the roving tendencies of an urbanized, industrialized North, and therefore doubly anxious to idealize its own way of life; hence the strong plea for a harmless type of local color writing, such as was to flower lushly, especially in the South, during the postwar decades. Yet the Southerner's plea for a literature to do for Massachusetts and Virginia what Walter Scott and Robert Burns had done for Scotland was but a feebler echo of Emerson's clarion call for a genius who, with tyrannous eye, would grasp America's incomparable materials—her logrollings and stumps and politics, her northern trade and southern planting and western clearing—and find the proper symbols for them.<sup>32</sup> Fundamentally, southern and northern idealist alike were seeking the same ends, but they swore by different standards and institutions—the Southerner by his feudal plantation system, the Northerner by his expanding industrialism—and each believed sincerely in the ultimate good fostered by his way of life. In their search for a sectional literature, therefore, it was natural that Southerner, Northerner, and Westerner together should strive to idealize and romanticize the way of life which, separately, each one felt to be the best, divorcing it entirely, if possible, from the harsh realities of political and economic strife which were splitting the nation apart.<sup>33</sup>

Had there been no sectional cleavage on political and economic grounds, there would likely have developed much sooner the kind of regionalism in American literature which flourished during the latter half of the century. But however much individual writers or groups of writers continued to idealize contemporary life in art, the forces of the time were too powerful to ignore. The normal cultural tendency toward an inoffensive regionalism was overcome by a stronger, but equally

<sup>32</sup> R. W. Emerson, "The Poet," in *Essays: Second Series* (Boston, 1850).

<sup>33</sup> Rusk points out that even those western critics who were most severe in their censure of the unrealistic treatments of the West by eastern writers could not bring themselves to write any more realistically of their region in their own novels and poems, or even in their biographies. Critics everywhere were quick to denounce the want of *vraisemblance* in the literature of the time; yet any writer who attempted to portray American life too faithfully soon found the critics crying for his scalp and condemning his lack of taste. Few questioned, until Nathaniel Hawthorne and Herman Melville, the optimistic creed of either society or the individual. *The Literature of the Middle Western Frontier*, I, 272-74.

natural, tendency toward sectional antagonism. Instead of acting as a solvent for the problem of nationalism in art, regionalism was itself submerged, and the problem, aggravated by the political and social conditions of the times, became a point of conflict between opposing ideologies rather than, as formerly, a stimulus to co-operative, though varied, methods of achieving the same basic ends. Sectional conflicts became increasingly difficult to reconcile as tensions set up in the 1820's and 1830's became almost unbearably taut in the later 1840's and early 1850's. Despite wistful demands for a toning down of bitter partisanship, a more acerbic note was to be heard in many a critic's judgments of his fellow writers.<sup>34</sup>

Such antagonism, though characteristic of much of the critical work done in the fifteen years before the Civil War, was more noticeable in Southerners, who were striving to shore up a crumbling regime. Southern reviews and literary journals could not avoid bearing heavily upon the topic of slavery, regardless of how remote it might be from the matter under discussion, whereas virtually all the leading literary journals of the North followed a "hands-off" policy, frowned upon the activities of the abolitionists, and generally avoided dragging the issue into literary criticism.<sup>35</sup> But the mere fact that eastern publishing centers dominated the nation's literary scene in itself tended to aggravate still further the growing antipathy between writers and critics, as well as between the political leaders of both sections.<sup>36</sup> Thus, the problem of forging a national literature, entangled as it was with such extra-literary questions as state rights and federalism, laissez-faire industrialism and slave agrarianism, the publishing business and international copyright, could never be approached in the rarefied atmosphere

<sup>34</sup> It is significant that Emerson who for years had ranged himself with the moderate Whigs of New England in attempting to tone down the fanaticism of abolitionists and other reformers finally exploded with savage indignation upon the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law and, after the Sumner-Brooks incident, began denouncing the South as a whole in language as immoderate as that of William Lloyd Garrison. See Hubbell, "Literary Nationalism in the Old South," *loc. cit.*, 200.

<sup>35</sup> Frank L. Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1850* (New York, 1930), 456-63.

<sup>36</sup> Hubbell, "Literary Nationalism in the Old South," *loc. cit.*, 198-201.



of esthetics so long as these questions remained unsettled.<sup>37</sup> In fact, only that literary work which remained safely on the fringe of the actual could be examined in a spirit of relative moderation. Longfellow's poetry, which offended no one, could be discussed calmly and favorably by southern as well as northern critics. But let the literary work touch ever so lightly upon the problems of contemporary life, naming names or dealing with ideas of topical significance, and at once sectional, local, professional, or sectarian antagonists sprang into frenzied action.

In striking contrast to the deference generally paid to Longfellow's work in the South, the sarcastic reception given James Russell Lowell's *Fable for Critics* underscores the attitude of growing southern resentment. For all its overdone puns and metrical whimsicalities, the *Fable* did not lack positive critical merits; yet its provincial plain speaking so enraged southern critics that they attacked it blindly and savagely. Doubting that the poem could have been written by Lowell (whose poetry hitherto had been "thoughtful and sentimental"), one of them found in it many false, brutal, nasty comments on southern slavery and concluded that its author had "a bad, malicious heart."<sup>38</sup> Lowell's favorable opinions of Emerson, Bronson Alcott, and Theodore Parker—all of whom this writer regarded as monsters—drove him to a climactic utterance of scorn:

We have long been prepared to believe that Boston would come to this. They have a school of teachers, possessing large popularity, intense self-esteem, and considerable ingenuity, who, with new *isms* and *ologies* daily, will some day contrive to throw down all their altars of belief. Were they a more inflammable race, . . . we might look for the advent among them of a Goddess

<sup>37</sup> Typical examples of the touchy southern attitude can be found in almost any review of eastern writers published in southern journals after 1840. Before settling down to a discussion of the writer, his works, and their merits, the southern reviewer often had to preface his criticism with an extensive introduction "explaining" why so many writers worthy of attention seemed to reside in Cambridge and justifying the dearth of them in the South by concluding that, while the North could boast of a majority of abler writers, the South's "peculiar institution," which required eternal vigilance, bred abler political thinkers. See E. DeLeon, "Our Poets," in *Southern Literary Messenger*, VIII (1842), 567-73.

<sup>38</sup> *Southern Quarterly Review*, XVI (1849), 239-42. The reviewer may have been Simms, who became editor of this periodical the next year.

of Reason, and a Reign of Terror, not imperfectly modelled upon those of the French. Their safety lies in their desire for the flesh-pots, and in the fact that they are already in possession of too large a share of worldly goods to venture much in dangerous experiments. Were they *sans culottes*, we should, in all probability, very soon behold a Temple of Reason in Boston, usurping that of Jesus Christ.<sup>39</sup>

Poe likewise, though not concerned with the decay of religious orthodoxy implied here, found only malevolence and little humor in the *Fable*, and attacked Lowell severely for his antislavery sentiments and his failure to acknowledge the existence of any other southern writers but Poe himself.<sup>40</sup>

These were the two sorest points for the southern critic, who thought that eastern writers and publishers, specifically those of Boston and New York, made up a conspiracy to subdue in every way the literary aspirations of other sections. Northern critics seemed determined never to do justice to writers who had not the good fortune to have been born in the North; the system was "rigged," and therefore concluded the southern critic: "Let our readers be assured that, (as matters are managed among the four or five different *cliques* who control our whole literature in controlling the larger portion of our critical journals,) it requires no small amount of courage . . . to *hint*, even, that any thing good, in a literary way, can, by any possibility, exist out of the limits of a certain narrow territory."<sup>41</sup>

This feeling of frustration, of being helplessly trapped by a system which their own people ironically continued to support, became a matter of increasing concern to southern critics as events of greater import than mere literary credit widened the breach between North and South. Well aware of the power of the written word, they feared on the one hand the cumulative weight of propagandist pressure thrown against their institutions by northern radicals, and on the other the almost complete lack of adequate counterpropaganda which might be applied to present their case before the world. Accordingly, by the mid-1850's the characteristic tone of southern criticism had become

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 241.

<sup>40</sup> "Notices of New Works," in *Southern Literary Messenger*, XV (1849), 189-91.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

one of bitter recrimination.<sup>42</sup> Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that critical efforts to establish a norm for American literary expression on any sectional basis were doomed to failure. Southern writers had long hoped to keep literature and the slavery question apart, regarding their participation in the one as a matter of national interest and in the other as their own special affair. In 1845 the editor of the *Southern Literary Messenger* had expressed this distinction by saying:

... we are a *Southerner*, and mean to maintain Southern institutions, rights and interests. So far the Messenger will be *distinctively* SOUTHERN. In Literature and other general matters, it will not be sectional, but National, and always independent.

We do not regard Slavery as a National matter; but the security and peace of the slave-holding States in reference to Slavery are matters of deep NATIONAL interest and obligation.<sup>43</sup>

In the 1850's, however, such nice distinctions could no longer be maintained.

As a climactic example of the two hostile worlds in which American critics now lived, one need only consider briefly the book which, more than any other, has been credited with precipitating open warfare between North and South—*Uncle Tom's Cabin*. For the genteel southern critic as well as his northern counterpart, the basic purpose of all imaginative work had been to elevate the sensibilities: "its main object was to kindle and purify the imagination, while fanning into a livelier flame the slumbering charities of the human heart."<sup>44</sup> In the eyes of half the nation *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was just such a book: its underlying purpose was moral and humanitarian, and northern sentiment was

<sup>42</sup> One article entitled "Northern Periodicals Versus the South" specifically charged *Harper's* and *Putnam's* with undermining southern institutions, its main point being that although these were *literary* magazines ostensibly dedicated to the interests of the entire nation, they had entered the field of politics with a partisan bias subtly cloaked in moderation and now sought to destroy the South under pretense of saving the Union. The critic called down shame upon these northern writers and double shame upon the publishers who allowed them "thus to traduce, insult and injure those who . . . had been liberal and unsuspecting patrons." His conclusion re-echoed the question: How long did the South intend to put up with such treatment? *Southern Quarterly Review*, XXVI (1854), 503-11.

<sup>43</sup> "Editor's Table," in *Southern Literary Messenger*, XI (1845), 62.

<sup>44</sup> "Uncle Tom's Cabin," *ibid.*, XVIII (1852), 721.

almost unanimously favorable.<sup>45</sup> In the eyes of Southerners *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was fiction of the basest sort, incompatible with its essence and alien to its original purpose. "Engaging in the coarse conflicts of life, and mingling in the fumes and gross odours of political or polemical dissension," the book "stained and tainted the role of ideal purity with which it [fiction] was of old adorned."<sup>46</sup> The central flaw in American critical thinking, which for years had been undermining all attempts to mold a national literature, was here exposed. So long as American fiction and poetry were written "for the sake of the inspiration, the hope, or the resignation which they instil" (the unmistakable formula for a popular poem by Longfellow), they were to be welcomed and encouraged. But, wrote the irate southern critic, "if their mission is to produce discontent, to be the heralds of disorder and dissension, then . . . let us bid them avaunt!"<sup>47</sup>

The South's only recourse against such slanderous attacks, southern critics now believed, would be to produce a powerful literature of its own, unadulterated with any pretense of its being both sectional and American. This was an opportunity which Southerners had let slip by; through their own negligence and indifference, the South had now been placed at the mercy of the North where every two-penny witling could besmirch its way of life for profit.<sup>48</sup> The irony of the southern critics' position lay in the belief that there was yet time—if only the South would support its own periodicals and writers—to demonstrate the superior benevolence of its system. Still more ironical, however, was the tacit admission that henceforth, in order to give a compelling literary form to southern thought, real social evils would have to be faced in a southern literature which would abandon the clouds of ideal purity to mingle in the "fumes and gross odours" of politics. To overcome such specious attacks as Mrs. Stowe's, Southerners would have to write powerful books demonstrating that any and all forms of social organization resulted in many instances of human misery; their works

<sup>45</sup> Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1850*, pp. 553-54.

<sup>46</sup> "Uncle Tom's Cabin," *loc. cit.*, 721.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 724-25.

would have to shock the world into realizing that in the North every turn of a mill wheel brought more misery to more individuals than any degree of it contrived in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and that the triumph of southern slavery lay in the mutual dependence of master and slave for happiness and security.<sup>49</sup>

The core of the sectional dilemma in American literary criticism is in such arguments as these. More clearly than any other single work of American authorship at the time, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* dramatized an irreconcilable split in the national character which would have to be bridged somehow before a national literature could emerge. So long as the national character reflected two entirely different ways of life based upon opposing philosophies and expanding from the pressures of conflicting inner drives, each insisting upon its own fundamentally moral and benevolent purpose but finding evil and chaos in the other, there could be no hope for the solidarity required to realize those dreams of an American literature which had inspired the Connecticut Wits. The dilemma might have been evaded in literature by means of a literature of escape, as it had been in politics by a series of compromises. Critics might have sought to avoid the issues raised by opposing philosophies by requiring literature to elevate and purify the imagination without "mingling in the fumes and gross odours" of American life. But once the issues themselves came to a head there was no further escape. For southern critics the only way out of the dilemma was to demand a strong and separate southern literature. After what seemed to them a prolonged and galling vassalage in both cultural and economic affairs, their southern sectionalism had inevitably transformed itself into southern nationalism.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 728-30.

## Development of the Cotton Industry by the Five Civilized Tribes in Indian Territory

BY GILBERT C. FITE

Practically every phase of the agricultural history of the Five Civilized Tribes has been neglected. Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole farm production has been hastily passed over by literally scores of writers who have found the "Trail of Tears" or some other social theme more interesting and rewarding. But these Indians were well advanced in civilization; how they made a living is significant and deserves attention. The production of cotton is one of the little known yet important phases of their agricultural development.

By 1801 at least four of the Five Civilized Tribes were producing cotton. The area occupied by the Choctaws and Chickasaws in Mississippi and northwestern Alabama was ideally suited to the production of this important staple. The Creeks in Alabama, as well as the Cherokees in parts of Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia, were also in favorable cotton-growing regions. As the nineteenth century opened these Indians, for the most part, had settled down to agricultural pursuits. Although exact and specific information on cotton growing by the Indians in the early 1800's is lacking, incidental references are found in the reports of Indian agents and travelers. In 1801 the Creek agent reported: "Cotton is raised in several places, but in small quantities, by Indians; it does well throughout the agency. The green seed is in general use, and well suited to the northern half of the agency; and the sea island cotton, from two successive experiments, promises to do well on the southern half. Some cotton has been sent to market."<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, the Choctaws, comprising about fifteen thousand

<sup>1</sup> *American State Papers, Indian Affairs* (2 vols., Washington, 1832-1834), I, 647.

individuals, had started to grow cotton and were soon producing more than any other tribe. A commission reporting to the Secretary of War in December, 1801, declared that "a very few [Choctaw] families have commenced the culture of cotton."<sup>2</sup> While references to cotton production by the Chickasaws are fewer and less specific, they, too, were producing on a small scale. There is abundant evidence that the Cherokees were cultivating cotton in the 1790's, although the accounts differ as to its origin among them. The Rev. Jedidiah Morse, who traveled among the Indians in 1820, included in his report a chief's explanation that an Indian agent, Silas Dinsmoor, was responsible for encouraging the Cherokees to grow cotton as early as 1796 or 1797. Stephen H. Long, however, in recounting his experiences among the Cherokees in Arkansas during his western expedition, credited its introduction to Governor William Blount, first governor of the Southwest Territory.<sup>3</sup>

The Indians immediately began to utilize their production. Frequent requests reached the United States government for cotton cards and spinning wheels. The government partially supplied the Indians with this equipment, although it was sometimes slow in making deliveries. In the spring of 1801, for instance, the government delivered "one hundred [pair] cotton cards and eighty spinning wheels" to the Creeks.<sup>4</sup> Even a young Englishman from Stockport was brought in by the Creek agent to make spinning wheels and looms for the Indians.<sup>5</sup> One Creek chief is known to have made his own spinning wheel and loom. During 1801 and 1802 the Choctaw and Chickasaw chiefs frequently asked for gins, cards, and wheels. Morse, twenty years later, reported that Choctaws "spun and wove ten thousand yards" of cloth. One ingenious Indian raised his own cotton and made machinery for spinning and weaving it into yard goods.<sup>6</sup> The Cherokee census rolls of

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 659.

<sup>3</sup> Jedidiah Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War of the United States on Indian Affairs* (Washington, 1822), 167. See also Edwin James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains, Performed in the Years 1819, 1820 . . . Under the Command of Maj. S. H. Long*, Part IV, in Reuben Gold Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels, 1748-1846* (32 vols., Cleveland, 1904-1907), XVII, 22.

<sup>4</sup> *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 647.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War*, 182.

1835 indicate that in practically every family one or more persons could spin and weave. This was true in both the full- and mixed-blood families.<sup>7</sup>

Occasionally references can be found to the sale of cotton, but it seems quite clear that most of the early production among the Indians was used domestically. But Abram Mordecai, a Jewish trader among the Indians, set up a cotton gin in 1802 below the junction of the Coosa and Tallapoosa rivers in south-central Alabama and bought cotton from the Creeks. He then hauled the ginned cotton in small bags to Augusta, Georgia, on pack horses.<sup>8</sup> Presumably, difficulties with Spanish authorities prevented him from marketing his cotton via the Gulf. The Cherokees were shipping cotton down the Tennessee and Mississippi rivers before 1826. By that time the agent reported that nearly every family grew "cotton for its own consumption."<sup>9</sup> In fact, the Cherokees seemed to be making extensive use of cotton for domestic purposes as early as 1800.<sup>10</sup>

Government encouragement and an increased demand brought a steady expansion of cotton production among the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws. Benjamin Hawkins reported that the government distributed five hundred spinning wheels among the Creeks alone in 1812.<sup>11</sup> According to Secretary of War William Eustis, cotton cloth made by Choctaw hands in 1810 was definite evidence of their manufacturing progress, as well as a reflection of increased cotton culture.<sup>12</sup> Constant demands by the Indians for more equipment with which to manufacture cotton cloth are the best available evidence of the increased emphasis placed upon this crop.

Slave labor was used to a considerable extent among the Indians by 1830. The growth of this institution among the Five Civilized Tribes

<sup>7</sup> Cherokee Census Rolls of 1835 (typewritten copy in Indian Archives, Oklahoma State Historical Society, Oklahoma City).

<sup>8</sup> A. J. Pickett, *History of Alabama and Incidentally of Georgia and Mississippi* (2 vols., Charleston, 1851), II, 190.

<sup>9</sup> *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, II, 700.

<sup>10</sup> Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War*, 167.

<sup>11</sup> *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 840.

<sup>12</sup> Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States* (13 vols. to date, Washington, 1934- ), VI, *Mississippi*, 127.



may be partly responsible for their increased agricultural production, of which cotton was only a part. Some Indian planters owned many slaves. The Cherokee census of 1835 shows that a large number of Indian citizens owned between two and ten slaves. But James Brown, a mixed blood, owned twenty-eight Negroes, and some citizens held even more.<sup>13</sup>

With the exception of the Seminoles, the Five Civilized Tribes engaged widely in cotton production and domestic manufacture of cotton cloth before their removal west of the Mississippi. It is then not surprising that after their removal in the 1830's the Indians turned to cotton growing—at least to supply their own needs. The first Cherokees who emigrated to Arkansas Territory before 1817 began immediately to plant this accustomed crop. By the time Stephen H. Long visited them in their new home in 1819 some of the wealthier Cherokees raised large fields of cotton and manufactured their family clothing.<sup>14</sup> The Cherokees, and later the Choctaws and Chickasaws, settled in areas ideally suited to cotton culture. The Cherokees found the rich Arkansas River bottoms highly productive; and the Choctaws and Chickasaws discovered that bottoms along the Red River, as well as those of tributaries like the Washita, presented almost unlimited opportunities for agricultural production. In fact, as early as 1825 cotton had been raised in part of the area ceded to the Choctaws. Part of "Old Miller County," Arkansas, was included in the Choctaw cession and five thousand acres were in cultivation by the middle 1820's, five hundred of which were in cotton.<sup>15</sup> Transportation via the Arkansas and Red rivers greatly relieved the marketing problem so difficult in most frontier areas, and only lack of capital and initiative were serious obstacles to a considerable commercial output.

Under the tribal laws land was held in common. Every citizen was entitled to as much as he could cultivate and graze. This custom per-

<sup>13</sup> Cherokee Census Rolls of 1835.

<sup>14</sup> James, *Account of an Expedition . . . Under the Command of Maj. S. H. Long*, Part IV, in Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels*, XVII, 17-18.

<sup>15</sup> Rex W. Strickland, "Miller County, Arkansas Territory," in *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Oklahoma City, 1921- ), XIX (1941), 39.

mitted citizens with ambition and capital to build up relatively large estates on which they raised cotton, corn, wheat, and livestock. Negro slavery, already an established institution among the Indians, was another permissive factor in the growth of a limited number of large farms in Indian Territory. The largest estates were generally managed by mixed bloods or intermarried whites who had the rights of citizenship.

By 1840 cotton production was fairly well established in parts of the Indian Territory, particularly along the Red and Arkansas rivers. The Indian agent declared in December, 1836, that the Red River country was destined soon to become an outstanding cotton-growing area, probably justifying his optimism by the fact that the Choctaws alone shipped about five hundred bales down the Red River the preceding autumn.<sup>16</sup> And this by no means represented their total production. The next year a somewhat poorer crop was reported, but owing to the increased number of planters the total yield was approximately the same. By 1837 two gins were operating in the Choctaw Nation, and a short time later there were ten scattered along the Red River.

Most agricultural commodities produced by the Indians, including cotton, came from small farms of ten to twenty acres, or perhaps even less. Self-sustaining agriculture, so characteristic of the frontier, was typical in Indian Territory. This was particularly true of the Indians whose land did not border the Red, the Arkansas, or a tributary stream. The Creeks, residing mostly on the uplands between the South Canadian and the Arkansas, raised cotton but primarily for domestic use. Only a few planters along the South Canadian produced the fiber for commercial purposes. Some of the wealthier mixed-blood Cherokee, Choctaw, and Chickasaw citizens, however, cultivated large tracts with slave labor, not unlike the system in the Old South. A number of half-breed Chickasaws settled near Fort Towson in Choctaw territory for the express purpose of raising cotton on an extensive scale. Colonel Levi Colbert, for example, cultivated between three hundred and five hun-

<sup>16</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1836, p. 391.

dred acres of cotton in 1839. He lived like a southern gentleman and reportedly owned 150 slaves.<sup>17</sup>

One of the wealthiest men in the entire Southwest was a Choctaw, Colonel Robert M. Jones. He had one plantation of between four and five thousand acres, plus two other farms somewhat smaller in size.<sup>18</sup> By 1852 Jones had four plantations and hundreds of slaves. He raised about seven hundred bales of cotton in 1851 and shipped them down the Red River to market.<sup>19</sup> Joseph Vann, a member of the Cherokee aristocracy, cultivated extensive lands along the Arkansas River. He reputedly employed nearly three hundred slaves.<sup>20</sup>

During the 1840's the Choctaws annually marketed one thousand bales or more, and this was only a part of their total crop. Other tribes, particularly the Chickasaws and Cherokees, must have sold some, although the data are scarce and incomplete. At times exceptionally good corn prices caused the temporary decline of cotton culture. For example, in 1842 low cotton prices, plus the fact that the government contracted for twenty thousand bushels of corn, caused some of the wealthy Chickasaw and Choctaw planters to turn to corn.<sup>21</sup> But there was a gradual increase in cotton production from the time of the Indian removals to the Civil War.

Most of the Indian agents encouraged cotton production since they felt it supplied the need of a cash crop. It was an important part of a general agricultural economy which included the production of corn, wheat, oats, hay, livestock, vegetables, fruits, and even some sorghum and tobacco. Diversified farming was typical among the Five Civilized Tribes, but a high degree of specialization and commercialization had developed on the plantations along the Red and Arkansas rivers by 1850. Cotton was second only to corn in importance among the Choc-

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 1838, p. 480.

<sup>18</sup> Muriel H. Wright, "Early Navigation and Commerce on the Arkansas and Red Rivers in Oklahoma," in *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, VIII (1930), 81-82.

<sup>19</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1852, p. 412.

<sup>20</sup> Laura E. Baum, "Agriculture Among the Five Civilized Tribes, 1865-1906" (M.A. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1940), 9.

<sup>21</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1842, p. 445.

taws and Chickasaws on the eve of the Civil War, but to estimate the total production would be sheer speculation.

The slave population steadily increased. There were 7,369 Negro slaves held by members of the tribes in 1860, distributed among an Indian population of about 65,000. Of this number the Cherokees owned 2,504, the Choctaws 2,297, the Creeks 1,651, and the Chickasaws 917. The Seminoles were reported to have owned no slaves, although a few were undoubtedly held by members of this tribe.<sup>22</sup> The largest slaveholder was a Choctaw, presumably Robert M. Jones, who possessed 227 Negroes. Ten other Choctaw planters held 638 slaves, or an average of more than sixty each. The average among the Choctaws, however, was only six for each slaveholder. The majority of the slaves were owned by relatively few Indians, generally mixed bloods or intermarried white citizens who were the large agricultural producers.<sup>23</sup>

Most Indian women spun and wove cloth for domestic use. Indian agents and travelers made frequent note of domestic manufacturing. As early as 1842 there were thirteen looms among the Choctaws. Cyrus Byington recorded that during the year 2,227 yards of cloth had been made by only nine Choctaw families. Two families wove 1,240 yards.<sup>24</sup> This indicates that some surplus cloth was manufactured. The government had not fulfilled its treaty pledge of 1830 to supply the Choctaws with four hundred looms, but they gradually accumulated this equipment anyway. In some instances the Indians made their own spinning wheels and looms. The scattered and incomplete records indicate that most of the Indian families were producing enough cloth for their own needs or could get it from their neighbors who wove a surplus. Visitors to the Creek Nation in 1842 declared: "They expect soon to manufacture all the material for their own clothing."<sup>25</sup> Other travelers often

<sup>22</sup> In 1848 the Seminoles were reported to have owned 286 slaves. Some were later carried off by the Creeks, some left for Mexico, and others were killed by the Comanches. See Grant Foreman, *The Five Civilized Tribes* (Norman, 1934), Chap. 19.

<sup>23</sup> *Eighth Census of the United States, 1860, Population* (Washington, 1864), xv.

<sup>24</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1842*, p. 503.

<sup>25</sup> John D. Lang and Samuel Taylor, Jr., *Report of a Visit to Some of the Tribes of Indians Located West of the Mississippi* (Providence, 1843), 40.

commented on the domestic manufacture of Indian cloth. Generally it was of an exceptionally high quality. This situation was not unlike other frontier areas where household spinning and weaving were familiar arts.

The Civil War greatly disrupted normal agricultural developments in Indian Territory. During the war much of this area served as a battleground for the contesting forces. Livestock was driven off, crops were destroyed, and improvements were burned. Destruction was less severe in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, but farming was retarded and recovery came slowly after 1865. Conditions were made more difficult for the large producers because of the emancipation of the slaves. Indian agriculturalists found themselves desperately short of labor after the slaves were freed. Unlike conditions in the Old South where the Negroes finally settled down to the position of sharecroppers or tenants, the Negroes in the Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole nations were made citizens of their respective tribes. The Choctaws and Chickasaws made special arrangements for their freedmen.<sup>20</sup> Thus they could cultivate part of the common lands and avoid the degrading economic and social position of the sharecropper. The Indian planters consequently were faced with the choice of curtailing their production or seeking a new labor supply. They resorted to the latter and began to admit noncitizens from Texas and Arkansas.

The tribal government worked out a plan so that noncitizens could enter the Territory under a permit system whereby the employer paid a fee to the tribal government, varying with the tribe and time from \$1 to \$25 a year. It was illegal for an Indian citizen to lease land. But individual citizens circumvented this law by calling their payments to noncitizens a salary. The so-called salary was paid with part of the worker's production, thus in effect making the arrangement a lease. Another method by which noncitizens were admitted to Indian Territory was for a citizen to "employ" a noncitizen for a period of five or ten years. The noncitizen then would be located on part of the

<sup>20</sup> The Choctaws and Chickasaws refused to accept their former slaves as citizens. When the land allotments were finally made the freedmen got only forty acres each. But prior to that time the former slaves could cultivate part of the public domain.

unoccupied public domain. He was permitted to keep all he raised. At the end of the specified period the Indian received his income by taking an improved farm which he might give to his son. In this manner more Indian land was brought under cultivation and the agricultural output was increased. Around 1870 a few noncitizens were settling in the various Indian nations under these systems but as yet most crops were produced by citizens.

Cotton culture revived slowly after 1865. Most Choctaws were producing no cotton in 1867. The census of Eagle County, Choctaw Nation, reveals that, where formerly cotton had been extensively grown, only one planter had one hundred acres.<sup>27</sup> In Red River and Kiamichi counties very little cotton was grown until after 1868. But in 1870 many farms were back in production, and an "unusually large crop" was harvested. In the Chickasaw Nation a single small community raised 150 bales, and the agent reported similar production "on all the plantations along the river."<sup>28</sup> Yet the prewar output had not been reached. That year Indian leaders nostalgically declared: "South of the Canadian, and on the Arkansas and Red rivers and uplands intervening, cotton was formerly extensively cultivated, and was the most valuable crop of that region. We hope yet to see it again whitening large and well tilled fields, and bring treasure and wealth to our brothers of the Choctaws and Chickasaw Nations."<sup>29</sup> This hope was soon realized. Three years later the Commissioner of Indian Affairs estimated the Choctaw and Chickasaw production at five thousand bales.<sup>30</sup> No cotton was reported among the other tribes, but the Cherokees were growing substantial quantities. The Union agent said of the Cherokees in 1873:

There are a few large cotton-growers but most of it is being grown by small farmers. This season there is prospect of very fine cotton crops. This will bring money to the country as no other crop will. I look at the continued culture of cotton as a source of permanent prosperity to the people. I shall do all in my

<sup>27</sup> Choctaw Census, Eagle County, 1867 (Indian Archives, Oklahoma Historical Society).

<sup>28</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1870, p. 292.

<sup>29</sup> "Proceedings of the General Council of the Indian Territory," 1870 (typewritten copy in Indian Archives, Oklahoma Historical Society).

<sup>30</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1873, pp. 346-47.

power to encourage this branch of industry. . . . It furnishes that which has long been greatly needed—a commodity from which the farmers can realize in cash a quick reward from their labors.<sup>81</sup>

It is safe to assume that the Indians were producing between six and seven thousand bales of cotton for commercial purposes in 1873 and hundreds of other bales for domestic use. In contrast to 1868 when only a few farmers reported cotton, the 1874 census shows that practically every Indian farmer in Eagle County, Choctaw Nation, was growing two to twenty acres of this valuable staple. This was no doubt typical of other counties in the southern part of the Territory. Cotton was an important cash crop among the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and to a lesser extent among the Cherokees. Some idea can be gained of the emphasis placed on cotton production by examining the premiums offered at the Muskogee International Fair in 1880. A prize of twenty dollars was given for the best bale of cotton and ten dollars for the second best. These were the highest awards paid for the various farm crops exhibited.<sup>82</sup>

This represented the height of what can be considered strictly Indian production. After the middle 1870's it is more correct to refer to production in Indian Territory because the vast majority of farm produce was raised by noncitizen whites on Indian land. The greatest expansion of cotton culture began in this period. By 1882 there were approximately twelve thousand tenants or farm laborers in Indian Territory. The agent lamented that the fine crops were mostly produced "by the sweat of the white man who rents farms or labors by the month for Indians."<sup>83</sup> This influx of white settlers had little effect on the basic organization of agriculture in the Territory. Diversification and a high degree of self-sufficiency continued to characterize farming in the area.

The United States census discloses that approximately seventeen thousand bales of cotton were produced from 35,000 acres in 1879. Ten years later the acreage and yield had doubled, and this trend con-

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 205.

<sup>82</sup> "Indian-Pioneer History," XCI, 382 (typewritten copy in Indian Archives, Oklahoma Historical Society).

<sup>83</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1882, p. 87.

tinued. One of the salient features of Indian Territory agriculture from 1880 to the close of the tribal period in 1907 was the rapid growth of cotton culture.<sup>34</sup> Large plantations were prevalent in some sections. One farm in the Washita Valley had eight thousand acres and another four thousand. In 1890 one Chickasaw had a farm of two thousand acres, with fifty-three white tenants. Of course, only part of these estates was devoted to cotton. The tremendous influx of white noncitizen settlers into Indian Territory is illustrated by the fact that 90 per cent of the farm produce in the Choctaw Nation in 1888 came from these intruders. By 1900 about three-fourths of the total population in the Territory were whites who worked Indian land.<sup>35</sup>

By 1899 there were 45,505 farms in Indian Territory and over 25,000 of these produced cotton. The cotton acreage of 442,065 was 17.8 per cent of all crop land. The value of the 155,729-bale crop, however, was 32 per cent of the farm income among the Five Civilized Tribes, indicating the important relative position of cotton. Indian Territory was growing 1.8 per cent of the cotton raised in the United States. Of the 25,322 farms on which this staple was cultivated, 20,767, or about 80 per cent, were worked by white tenants. Most of the cotton was produced on medium-sized farms of twenty to fifty acres. However, as previously shown, there were many large estates.<sup>36</sup> In the total acreage cultivated, cotton was ever increasing in importance. In 1906, for example, the *Daily Oklaboman* reported that around Pauls Valley in Indian Territory "much of the soil that a year ago was a virgin prairie is this year in cotton."<sup>37</sup> Ardmore became the center of the cotton in-

<sup>34</sup> *Eleventh Census of the United States, 1890, Agriculture* (Washington, 1895), 61.

<sup>35</sup> Baum, "Agriculture Among the Five Civilized Tribes," 79. In 1885 Union Agent Robert L. Owen estimated that there were seventeen thousand farm laborers, workmen, and their families in Indian Territory. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1885*, p. 103.

<sup>36</sup> *Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900, Agriculture, Part II* (Washington, 1902), 422 ff. Nearly 600 farmers had from 260 to 500 acres; 292 tilled between 500 and 1,000 acres; and 191 cultivated over 1,000 acres.

<sup>37</sup> *Oklahoma City Daily Oklaboman*, October 21, 1906. The boll weevil did not hamper cotton production in Indian Territory. The first boll weevil was found in Bryan County, Indian Territory, in 1905. C. E. Sanborn and others, *History and Control of the Boll Weevil in Oklahoma* (Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Agricultural Experiment Bulletin No. 222, June, 1934), 4-5.



dustry among the Five Civilized Tribes. There, said an enthusiastic promoter, "cotton is king." The tremendous success of cotton production in Indian Territory was in no small part responsible for the popularity and spread of this crop into Oklahoma Territory after the opening in 1889. Railroads, which began penetrating the Territory in the 1870's, furnished new outlets for farm produce and stimulated general agricultural production.

The expansion of cotton raising in Indian Territory can best be seen by looking at the statistics at the close of the tribal period. The 35,000 acres cultivated in 1879 had been increased to 901,000 in 1906. The last year of tribal independence saw 410,520 bales produced on land owned by the Five Tribes.<sup>38</sup>

Cotton production played an important part in the economic development of the Five Civilized Tribes. The Choctaws and Chickasaws were the principal commercial producers, beginning a steady output in the 1830's. The strictly Indian production reached a high point around 1875, after which most cotton was grown by noncitizen whites. After the Civil War, as transportation improved, the domestic manufacture of textiles sharply declined. The tendency among the Indians was to sell their cotton and buy ready-made clothing. Thus the national pattern of greater commercialization in agriculture after the Civil War was also the trend in Indian Territory, although it was somewhat less pronounced. Probably cotton was second only to corn and livestock among part of the Civilized Tribes as they developed an economic society equal to that of many of their white noncitizen neighbors.

<sup>38</sup> *Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture*, 1910 (Washington, 1911), 573.

## Notes and Documents

PHILIP MAZZEI ON AMERICAN POLITICAL, SOCIAL,  
AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY HOWARD R. MARRARO

It is generally believed that the place of Philip Mazzei in American history is related almost entirely to his services from 1779 to 1783 as Virginia's agent in Europe to raise men and money to help the United States achieve independence. That is not the whole story. Almost from the moment of his landing in Williamsburg, Virginia, in the fall of 1773, Mazzei became an active collaborator with Thomas Jefferson and his Virginian friends in their efforts to establish republicanism on American soil. In numerous ways, almost to the time of his death in Pisa in 1816, he proved a constant and devoted servant of his adopted country. His wide travels and experiences and his varied social and business contacts with many influential men gave him an intimate knowledge of political, social, and economic problems, so that his articles and memoranda on these subjects, as they affected the United States, shed much light on difficulties the founding fathers faced. Although Mazzei lacked the preparation necessary to discuss these problems from a scientific and technical point of view, he was endowed with a good share of common sense—a quality that enabled him to think clearly and to reach accurate conclusions.

There are here published the English translations of six of Mazzei's articles, essays, and letters: 1. article on democracy published in John Pinkney's Williamsburg *Virginia Gazette* during 1774-1775; 2. memorandum to Count de Vergennes, the French minister of foreign affairs, dated the spring of 1780; 3. memorandum concerning slavery, 1781; 4. history of the beginning, progress, and end of the paper money of the United States of America, 1782; 5. observations on the bill regu-

lating the navigation of merchant ships in Virginia, 1784; 6. letter to John Blair, president of the Constitutional Society, 1785.<sup>1</sup>

1. *Article on Democracy*

Soon after his arrival in Virginia, Mazzei became convinced that a revolt of the American colonies against Great Britain was inevitable. Abandoning his agricultural pursuits for which he had purposely come to America, he devoted all his time and energy to the cause of the colonies, writing articles, delivering addresses and sermons, and enlightening his friends and neighbors on the issues at stake and on the theory and practice of democracy. Because of his imperfect knowledge of English, at first Mazzei wrote his articles in Italian which his friend Jefferson would then translate. Later, as his English improved, Mazzei wrote in that language, and Jefferson merely edited his writings. After the sixth or seventh article Jefferson did not find it necessary to make any corrections. "That phraseology," Jefferson would explain, "is not pure English, but everyone will understand you, and the effect will be more forceful. That is what matters."<sup>2</sup> The article on democracy and liberty was published in the *Virginia Gazette*, and there are apparently no extant copies of the issues in which it was printed. Fortunately Mazzei wrote an Italian version of the article,<sup>3</sup> on which this translation is based.

Extracts from articles published in newspapers at the beginning of the  
American Revolution by a citizen of Virginia

In order to achieve our purpose, my dear compatriots, we must consider the natural rights of man and the foundations of a liberal government. This discussion will clearly show us that the British government has never been a liberal government even when it attained its highest perfection, and that our own

<sup>1</sup> Some of these articles formed an appendix to the second volume of Filippo Mazzei, *Memorie della vita e della peregrinazioni del fiorentino Filippo Mazzei* (2 vols., Lugano, 1845-1846) but were not included in the present writer's translation, *Memoirs of the Life and Peregrinations of the Florentine Philip Mazzei, 1730-1816* (New York, 1942).

<sup>2</sup> Mazzei, *Memoirs*, 203-204.

<sup>3</sup> Mazzei, *Memorie*, II, 284-88. The Institute of Early American History and Culture is at present indexing all known copies of the Williamsburg *Virginia Gazette*. Entries through April, 1775, have been indexed. A staff member of this project advises that he does not find this article under Mazzei's name. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Mazzei's article appeared in an issue or issues of which there are no extant copies.

government was nothing but a poor copy of the British model and, owing to this and other disadvantages, it was but a little better than a government of slavery.

Presently we shall examine the manner in which a government should be organized in order to be both impartial and permanent.

This subject has been so fully treated by many authoritative writers that I do not aspire to any other distinction than that of treating it in a simple and familiar style so that we may easily understand each other.

I beg the indulgence of writers who employ a lofty style. They really do not need anyone to write for them. I write for those who, though endowed with common sense, have not had the advantage of any education. I seek to adapt my style to their level of understanding. I know too well that a lofty style has frequently won the approbation of men who are, unfortunately, disposed to admire what they do not understand. But the time has finally come to change that custom; our duty is to try to understand so that we may form our own judgment.

All men are by nature equally free and independent. This equality is necessary to establish a liberal government. Every individual must be equal to every other in his natural rights. The division of society into ranks has always been and will always continue to be a serious obstacle in the attainment of this end, and the reason is quite clear.

When the citizens of a country are divided into several classes, it is necessary to give each class its representation in the government; otherwise, one class will tyrannize over the others. But the representation cannot be made exactly equal and, even if it could, the course of human events demonstrates that the balance cannot be maintained for long; and however little one class may predominate over the others, the balance must break.

This is the reason why all the ancient republics were short-lived. At the time of their establishment, the inhabitants were divided into classes, and since they were always fighting against each other, each sought to have a larger representation than the others in the administration of the government. The result was that the lawmakers were forced to yield to the prejudicial force of conventions and to the opposing claims of the various parties. Under the circumstances the best thing they could do was to achieve a grotesque mixture of liberty and tyranny.

Their constitutional imperfections gave rise to many disorders, which have recently been described in the most unfavorable light by ill-intentioned persons in order to influence the good people of this continent against a republican form of government. Even some well-intentioned men have committed the same error. Since they paid no attention to the truly good principles of government, they did not understand the republics whose defects they described had nothing republican about them save the name.

I repeat that a truly republican form of government cannot exist except where all men—from the very rich to the very poor—are perfectly equal in their natural rights. Fortunately, we are now in such a position on this continent. However, history teaches us that wherever men have tried to introduce a republican government the inhabitants, as we have stated, have been divided into classes. Now when certain privileges are usurped by a portion of the inhabitants and denied to others, it is vain to hope for the establishment of a liberal and permanent government, unless the favored citizens are willing to relinquish their privileges and stand on a footing of perfect equality with the rest of the inhabitants. Since discrimination inevitably gives rise to envy and ill feeling, attempts to prevail over others will always be made; liberty will then always be insecure and finally doomed to collapse.

Let us make some observations on the Roman Republic, not so much because it is the most celebrated in history, but because the English use it as a comparison, in order to exalt the supposed perfections of their own government.

That state was at first a monarchy, since it was governed by only one man. Then, when the kings were banished, it became an aristocracy, for the government was controlled by a class of men known as *patricians*, corresponding to the English *lords* or *nobles*; all the other inhabitants, known as the *people*, were denied a voice in the government. After numerous efforts, the *people* were finally allowed to participate in the government. Some time later, and as the *people* gradually advanced according to their circumstances, they obtained a share in the government which was supposedly the same as that enjoyed by the *patricians*. The government was then a mixture of aristocracy and democracy.

The *nobles* were unwilling to accept a position of equality with the *people*; on the other hand, the *people* vigorously and justly opposed the claims of superiority of the *nobles*. Thus pride on the one hand, and resentment on the other, kept the two parties in almost constant conflict, until such time as a fortunate usurper made his way through this chaos and succeeded in taking the throne.

In this manner, in less than five centuries, a great and powerful republic came to its end. The patriotism and heroism which seemed hereditary qualities in almost all Romans did not suffice to preserve liberty in the republic, because the government had not been founded on a basis of equality. Had the patricians been willing to renounce their hereditary privileges, and had they been willing to stand on an equal footing with the rest of the inhabitants, the government would then have been perfectly democratic and stable, and would perhaps have existed down to our own day.

Democracy, I mean representative democracy, which embraces all individuals in one simple body, without any distinction whatsoever, is certainly the only form of government under which true and enduring liberty may be enjoyed. Unfortunately for the human race, this form of government has never existed.

The sacred name of democracy has been abused by chaotic governments built on false and unstable principles.

The lower classes of society have never held the reins of government, unless they have seized them by force from the hands of the powerful at times when the insolence and tyranny of the privileged classes have provoked insurrections. The people have never been aggressors and have never revolted until the oppressors have worn down their subdued patience. Therefore, we should not be surprised at the confusion and disorder resulting from a spirit of vengeance in a maddened crowd that has been so unjustly provoked. Rather we should be surprised to find that there are people so blinded by prejudice that they dare give the name of democratic government to such a disordered and confused state of affairs, and that they should fear or pretend to fear those same wrongs in order to instill harmful principles concerning the rights of the lower classes of inhabitants, not realizing that these wrongs always resulted from having deprived the lower classes of their rights.

From the dawn of the recorded history up to the death of Queen Elizabeth, the government of England was either a despotic monarchy or an intolerable aristocracy, or a mixture of both, the nobles possessing greater or lesser power depending upon the greater or lesser ability of the rulers.

This is not the place for us to examine the history of these transgressions, the acts of tyranny and cruelty in those barbarous centuries, nor do we wish to study the origin of the communes and the extent to which they continued to play an insignificant role; our only aim is the examination of that government in its highest degree of perfection.

## 2. *Memorandum to Count de Vergennes*

During his mission to Europe Mazzei spent some time in Paris where he met his old friend the Marquis Domenico Caracciolo,<sup>4</sup> who was at the moment minister to France of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Mazzei discussed with him the advantages which commerce with the United States would bring to France and Italy. In sympathy with Mazzei's views, the Marquis advised his friend to write his opinions on the subject, especially as they concerned France, to present to the Count de Vergennes. As soon as Mazzei finished the article, the Marquis Caracciolo delivered it to the French foreign minister. It is not known what disposition was made of the article, but the Count found occasion to thank the author for his views.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Caracciolo (1715-1789) was in the Neapolitan diplomatic service from 1753 to 1781, the last decade of which period he spent in Paris. In 1781 he was appointed viceroy of Sicily, and in 1786 he headed the government at Naples.

<sup>5</sup> Mazzei, *Memoirs*, 247.

Memorandum on the United States to the Count de Vergennes, Paris,  
Spring, 1780<sup>a</sup>

Commerce should aim at increasing the population, industry, and wealth of a nation. In order to achieve these objectives, it is necessary to regulate commerce in such a way that the native manufacturers of a country be exchanged, so far as possible, for raw materials.

A person who exports more manufactured goods than he imports is engaged in active trade, because the debtor must balance his account with raw materials and money, a situation which, in his case, results in passive trade.

It follows, therefore, that through its industries, a country may be rich and populated, even though its area is so small or the quality of its soil so poor (as is the case of Genoa) that it cannot produce sufficient food for its inhabitants.

The United States of America is an exception to this general rule, and will continue to be so as long as its population is small in comparison with its area. This will require about a century. At the present time the total number of people in the thirteen states is less than four million, including slaves; and the territory of Virginia alone is large enough for sixteen or eighteen million inhabitants.

This enormous area of excellent soil, and man's natural desire to come into possession of it, will keep the inhabitants widely separated, until such a time as the greatly increased population makes the purchase of land more expensive and difficult.

The vast distances separating the inhabitants and the large profit they will derive from the cultivation of agricultural products in a land where, thanks to the fertility of the soil, this will require but little effort, are both serious obstacles in the way of establishing manufactures, since these would cause wages and other expenses to rise to such a point that locally manufactured goods would cost much more than those from Europe, despite the cost of transportation, commissions, etc.

This is why Americans order from Europe not only articles of luxury, but even the most common and ordinary effects, household furniture, farm tools, etc. This also explains why Europeans are able to conduct an active trade with them. It is therefore to the interest of those European nations which are in a position to trade with America to acquire as much of her commerce as possible, and also to help Americans trade their raw materials, so that they may not be tempted or forced to manufacture their own goods. The English had adopted this method, and since they held exclusive trading privileges, they derived an annual net profit of about three million pounds sterling.

Ever since the year 1776, I have become increasingly convinced that, considering all circumstances, in the natural course of events, France could acquire about fifty per cent of America's trade. She can do this in good grace and with-

<sup>a</sup> Mazzei, *Memorie*, II, 289-95.

out demanding any exclusive privileges. I am of the opinion that France should not show any desire to hold exclusive privileges. All that is necessary is for France to require assurances that exclusive privileges will not be granted to any other nation.

The general character of the American people and many other considerations lead me to predict that the advantages France will derive from her trade as well as from her alliance with the Americans will be all the greater, more agreeable, and permanent, the more willing she shows herself to permit them to enjoy free trade. France should also show a friendly, almost paternal solicitude for America's welfare by seeing to it that she obtains the best returns from her dealings with other nations.

I do not mean, however, that the principle of free trade should give Americans the right to introduce slaves and manufactured articles into the French islands. These two exceptions must be made, not because I foresee any possible harm in the near future, but to forestall any unforeseen circumstance that may arise. These restrictions are not only desirable, but do not in any way run contrary to the best interests and present views of the American people, who need to purchase rather than sell manufactured articles and who are also seriously thinking of abolishing slavery.

I do not know whether Americans have ever participated in the slave traffic. I rather believe it to be an exclusive privilege of the London African Company. It is certain that before the Revolution, the Virginia Assembly enacted laws forbidding the admission of slaves to the country. These laws, however, were vetoed by the King of England. But since some American merchants might conceive in the future the idea of importing slaves into other countries, even though they are forbidden to bring them into their own country, the above-mentioned precautions would seem to be wise.

The same precautions should be taken for manufactured articles, since the low price of certain commodities, local advantages, or other unforeseen circumstances in states lacking vast areas of uncultivated land might facilitate the manufacture of articles which, were they exported to the islands, would in time prove harmful to French manufactures.

As to foodstuffs, however, I am of the opinion that free trade will prove advantageous from every point of view.

The French colonists will import only staples from America and only as long as they can get them more cheaply than from France. In this case, as they become richer, they will be able to make more use of manufactured goods and articles of luxury. Even a limited trade in these articles is much more advantageous than commerce in most foodstuffs, which never affect trade in other articles.

As the sale of manufactured articles increases, and it surely must increase even though there may be no new source than the acquired commerce with the United States, the population and the consumption of staples must also necessarily increase. Provinces with a surplus supply of staples may furnish them to others



that have an insufficient amount. But even supposing that France should have a larger supply of staples than she needs, it must be remembered that for many years wheat has sold at high prices in the markets of Spain, Portugal, and the ports of Genoa and Leghorn. Experience proves that in order to supply these markets adequately, the surplus in those European localities which are accessible to navigation would not have been sufficient had not North America frequently contributed an additional supply.

During the past sixteen years, England, which prior to that time had exported merchandise valued at about four hundred thousand pounds sterling annually, not only has practically ceased exporting merchandise, but has been replaced, from time to time, by America and Holland. Various causes, harmful to England, have contributed to bringing about this change. It is not the purpose of our subject to describe these causes.

Although England could previously have sold wheat in the form of flour at higher prices in her own islands and thus profit on the grinding, still she preferred to sell it unground in Europe at lower prices and to leave that branch of the trade to North America.

I have not the least doubt but that England, after peace is concluded, will be very anxious to have Americans continue to sell foodstuffs to the inhabitants of her islands. In fact, I believe the English will want to transport the merchandise to them directly, just as France can do by taking advantage of her shipping.

In addition to all that has been said to allay the fears of persons who think that French agriculture will be harmed, it must be noted that, as the demand for manufactured articles increases, raw materials must be produced in larger quantities than in the past. And even if this should result in a reduction in the prices of staple commodities needed by the vast majority of the population, it should prove something more to be desired than feared. I personally believe, however, that it cannot happen.

Besides, the principle that the quality of raw materials is in direct relation to their prices is not at all true, for if it were so, it would strike a fatal blow to agriculture, the very backbone of all types of industry. What is needed is the establishment of a proper relationship, which always works itself out, provided laws do not interfere with it.

A few merchants and millers might possibly suffer some loss, but this is negligible compared with the enormous benefits resulting to the country at large. There is no doubt that Americans should not be granted permission to sell dried codfish to the French islands, if such practice should prove harmful to French fishing and shipping. But I don't think this is likely to happen.

I feel certain that, even if their fishing should be much more abundant than it has ever been in the past, Americans will easily find a market for it. Codfish is liked in France, the French of the islands will always prefer it for their own use, because the French people season it much better than do others. Even if

there should be a surplus supply, Spain, Portugal, and Italy can never have enough of it.

Oil, olives, wine, brandy, and all kinds of dried and preserved fruit are important staples which Americans will always prefer to buy from France rather than from other countries. But, in my opinion, these are not the most important products, for they are easily marketable and do not help manufacture much.

Coarse and fine cloths, silks, and especially stockings and ribbons and all manner of feminine fineries are articles of great importance, in the production of which no nation can rival France.

The lack of time makes it impossible to mention all manufactured articles which the Americans want because of their widespread use. These articles can be made more cheaply in France than in England. It is enough to state that there is no article for human consumption which the inhabitants of the southern states would not buy, down to stairsteps, windows, and doors for their factories.

P. S. Since the period described, the territory of the United States has more than doubled and, although the population has quadrupled, the above arguments still hold.

Pisa, August 4, 1810.

### 3. *Memorandum on slavery, 1781*

Before the outbreak of the American Revolution the question of slavery had occupied the attention of the Virginia Assembly, which attempted to prohibit the further importation of slaves and to give masters the right to free their slaves. Mazzei stated that Jefferson, John Blair, and several others favored the complete abolition of slavery, "in the name of humanity and justice," and that he and George Mason were the only two in the group who objected to immediate abolition. Mazzei explained that he ardently wished to see complete abolition as soon as circumstances permitted, but that such a step seemed too dangerous at the moment, since the number of Negroes exceeded the white population by two to one. Moreover, he believed that greater benefits would follow if the slaves knew that their masters were inclined to bestow freedom on all those whose good conduct merited it, whereas if all Negroes were suddenly liberated, the white people ran the risk of causing them to conclude that the act was brought on by fear. This situation, according to Mazzei, was undesirable and to be avoided.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Mazzei, *Memoirs*, 221-22.

## Memorandum concerning slavery\*

It is very natural for lovers of humanity and justice to be amazed when they hear that slavery exists in the United States of America, despite a glorious revolution, and the fact that the leaders of the new government breathe naught but liberty and equality. The subject demands serious consideration in order to determine whether or not the circumstances outweigh or diminish the charge. The opposition of the English Government to those colonies that attempted to remove the evil or at least to restrict its growth has already been mentioned. It is generally believed that the number of slaves does not total 50,000 in the eight northern states, and exceeds 650,000 in the five southern states.

Small evils are easily remedied, but great evils require time and good management; undue hurry may render the cure worse than the malady. The evil of slavery in the five southern states is certainly the worst that could exist, the most humiliating, and the most difficult to redress. Every just man agrees that this condition should be abolished as soon as possible, but the means suggested thus far are subject to grave difficulties. Whatever method may be adopted to free the slaves, it is first necessary to educate them so that they may be able to recognize their liberty and make good use of it.

4. *History of the beginning, progress, and end of the paper money of the United States of America, 1782*

During the American Revolution Mazzei noted the financial crisis that developed in the states as a result of the large amount of paper money in circulation and its consequent devaluation to the point that it was impossible for him, while in France and Italy, to make European merchants understand the security offered in trade by the citizens of the United States. To disabuse the minds of the people with whom he discussed the question, Mazzei wrote an article on the subject.

Currency and finance continued to be of interest to Mazzei. On two other occasions he was obliged to write on the same topic. During the French Revolution he wrote a pamphlet addressed *Au peuple français sur les assignats par un citoyen des États-Unis d'Amérique*. In 1792, while in Warsaw, Mazzei wrote his observations on the nature of cur-

\* Manuscript in the Maruzzi Archives, Pisa. The Maruzzis are descendants of Mazzei.

The following note appears on the back of memorandum:

"Ph. J. to F. M.

Will you come and take a family dinner with me today? Pio will be here. Monday, August 27, [and in pencil] 1781."

rency and exchange to prevent the issue of scrip by the Polish government.<sup>9</sup>

History of the beginning, progress, and end of the paper money  
of the United States of America<sup>10</sup>

The paper money which was placed in circulation by the United States of America to make up for the want of currency caused much serious speculation. It has been the greatest handicap to which the American cause has been subjected, and the only basis on which the enemies of the country were able to found some hope of injuring it. Therefore, the history of its beginning, progress, and end may be of interest to the curious and may furnish some light to persons who may be contemplating commercial or other relations with those States.

The commerce of the United States with England had always been very disadvantageous to the United States because, ever since the days of Charles II, America had yielded to England the right to regulate it. Hence the United States, despite its immense natural wealth, has never had an abundance of specie. This necessarily caused an unfavorable balance of trade, as a result of which merchants, instead of using drafts, were forced not only to send back to England the little English money that came into the country through the frequent intercourse of private persons in the two hemispheres, but also sent a substantial part of the Spanish money which had been introduced there by the trade with the islands in such quantity that, had it not been exported, it would have been more than sufficient for internal circulation.

Because of these factors currency was often lacking, and it became necessary to make up the deficiency with bank notes, that is, paper money. This, therefore, was nothing new for Americans at the beginning of the present war; they knew also from experience that a large amount of paper money results in the devaluation of currency. In the previous war the American colonies, by a voluntary and excessive desire to help England, had contracted a debt of about ten million pounds sterling. As a result paper money of the State of Massachusetts became so devaluated that it lost as much as ten-elevenths of its original value, so that one had to give eleven pounds in paper money to purchase something that could have been bought for one in real money. But since the Americans had almost entirely paid off this debt before the Revolution, very little paper money remained in circulation, which moreover had reacquired all its lost value. In the year 1773, when the disturbances began, that is, ten years after the end of the

<sup>9</sup> An English translation of extracts from this pamphlet, *Riflessioni sulla natura della moneta e del cambio* (Pisa, 1803), is published in Howard R. Marraro, "Philip Mazzei and his Polish friends," in *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America* (New York, 1942- ), II (1943-1944), 818-22.

<sup>10</sup> Mazzei, *Memorie*, II, 205-13.

previous war, transactions were being conducted almost entirely in specie, which, however, was not plentiful.

The first step taken by the Americans to alienate Great Britain was the agreement not to purchase anything from that country. However, since individuals were generally much indebted to her, they decided that, for an agreed period of time, the exportation not only of goods but of cash as well be not interfered with, preferring the principle of good faith to government policy. Wherefore, before communication between the two countries was completely severed, America remained almost entirely without currency. The State of Virginia, at the beginning of 1775, managed with difficulty to raise a sum of about ten thousand sequins in specie to buy a supply of gunpowder from the near-by islands.

The respective states had already placed a substantial sum of paper money in circulation to supply municipal needs, and Congress, which had been entrusted with the conduct of war and foreign affairs, was soon obliged to authorize large and frequent issues. The congressional money circulated under identical conditions throughout all the states, since each state was obliged to redeem its own quota, and act as guarantor for all the others. The municipal money, however, did not have free circulation except in its own state, and the ease or difficulty of having it accepted in other states was determined by the distance and amount of trade between the state in which the money was to be spent and that in which it had been issued.

The causes contributing to the devaluation of this money were so many and varied that it could never have remained so long in circulation had it not been upheld by a truly unique spirit of patriotism, nor could it have come to such a successful end without the heroic generosity that accompanied it.

The difficulty of bringing American products to Europe and to the islands in exchange for general merchandise or for goods of absolute necessity (the importation of which was not so difficult as the exportation of the products) rendered it necessary at first to secure at least part of these goods with currency, which, having become very scarce, increased in price, as is the case with all things of which there is a dearth, in direct ratio to its supply and demand.

On that occasion, however, the spirit of patriotism prevented the price of specie, now a sort of commodity itself, from rising in proportion to its extreme scarcity and enormous demand. In fact, even after eighteen months, one could obtain six dollars in cash for seven and one-half of paper, whereas in many countries we observe almost daily the price of not very necessary goods increase from fifty to sixty per cent in one day, on the mere news of a forthcoming scarcity.

Many persons continued to spend specie on the same basis as bank notes, and for some time they accepted bank notes in payment for merchandise under the same terms as though paid for in specie. But since this zeal was not general it could produce no good results. Indeed had this been continued the result would

have been disastrous, since the good and zealous citizens would have been ruined, and all their wealth would have fallen into the hands of the timid, the dissatisfied, and the internal enemies, native as well as foreign, of whom there was a goodly number at the beginning.

It was, therefore, necessary for everyone to increase the price of goods uniformly in proportion to the increase in the value of the currency, which, as a consequence, caused the depreciation of paper money.

The artifices used to devalue it were so many that it would be impossible to enumerate them. British merchants scattered throughout America, and especially the Scotch, contributed greatly to it. The English Government and officials encouraged the bank notes, but demanded their salaries in gold and silver. Other tricks and frauds, seldom heard of in our times, were perpetrated. The greatest trouble arose in Pennsylvania.

The Quakers, who are generally rich and engaged in business, were the first to demand three or four times more in paper money than they would have accepted in currency, and bartered one for the other in that ratio. People who found themselves compelled to give so much money for goods of absolute necessity, began to raise the price of products and manufactured goods. Being obliged to buy many things in large quantities to supply public needs and especially to support the armies, and since they had no revenue at all, Congress and the governments of the several states were obliged to emit large issues of this paper money. This was because it was necessary to pay three or four dollars for what before could have been had for one. Soon the amount of paper money exceeded the needs of internal circulation and, since it could not circulate, nor have any value elsewhere, the excess issue became the real cause of the devaluation, not to mention the many other causes contrived by the craftiness of internal and external enemies. Among these causes, counterfeiting caused no little harm.

In 1778, in a boat bound for New York from Scotland seized by an American privateer, several million dollars of this counterfeit money were found as well as enough material to counterfeit perhaps everything that would be issued in the future. All the expedients which prudence could suggest to remedy the situation were put into practice, but they proved useless. A number of counterfeiters were discovered in different parts of the United States who were supplied with their materials by correspondents abroad. The quantity of paper money necessary to meet the demands of the internal commerce of the states having thus been tripled and quadrupled, it became clear that all the amounts of future issues would also be multiplied in such a way as to arouse the fear that they would soon be worthless. Another difficulty arose from the fact that the need for future issues could not be kept secret, as a consequence of which the bad effects of the increase of paper money were felt very often six months before it actually took place, for the sellers did not consider only the existent quantity, but also the future increase.

People had already begun to fear the consequences of the large amount of

inflated money, and to ask that adequate taxes be levied to reduce it to a proper amount and restore its value. But by this time the situation had grown so serious that it was impossible to prevent its getting worse.

The new taxes, although inadequate to the needs, wrought hardship on many people. This was due to the great disparity in the amounts possessed by individuals. The disparity, in turn, was due to fluctuations in the value of the money itself, to the great economy practised by some individuals, and to the excessive liberality of others, as well as to many other powerful reasons. Despite this, not only were these taxes borne patiently, but they were increased by universal consent. The evil, however, increased as did also the counterfeit currency, some of which could not at all be distinguished from the genuine.

At the beginning of 1779, they gave six and seven dollars in paper money for one in silver; in June of the same year ten and twelve; and by early 1780, up to thirty and forty. The changes were so rapid and so unequal that often there was a difference of one-third from one place to another at the same time.

Specie had begun to pour in at this time through various channels, but instead of serving to re-establish the value of paper money, it produced an entirely opposite effect. This was due to the fact that people desirous of possessing some of it (which was the natural effect of long and enforced privation), vied with each other to see who offered most to obtain it.

Various methods were contrived to change the financial system entirely. It was decided to withdraw all the paper money by taxation within the period of one year, in the hope of being able to take care of the necessary circulation with specie. The amount of this specie constantly increased, to which a new and limited issue of paper money bearing five per cent interest was added. This experiment was just, but it was foreseen (and unfortunately with reason) that the time which must perforce elapse between the abolition of the old and the establishment of the new financial system would be highly disastrous. In fact the plan was started, but could not be carried through. On the third monthly payment, the impossibility of continuing on to the twelfth was realized. In view of the aforementioned maximum disparity with which the money was distributed among individuals, this plan could not be carried out without enriching a few large possessors of this currency excessively and impoverishing and ruining all the others.

The easiest and most equitable way to remedy this serious situation was for every individual to renounce whatever credit the possession of that money gave him before the commonwealth and to satisfy himself, in return, with his being exempted from the taxes which the commonwealth would have had to levy in order to redeem it, without minding the fact that the credit he would have to forfeit would be greater than the amount which he would have had to pay in the assessment of taxes. In order to put this into effect it was necessary for people everywhere to feel themselves inspired by the same zeal at the same time. This is just what happened. The end of our paper money was sudden,

unexpected, and altogether surprising. Instead of causing a financial upheaval as had been expected, our paper money, after having been devalued with surprising rapidity to one thousand and two thousand to one, disappeared, never to appear again. This not only caused no grumbling, but even met with universal satisfaction.

Since the outbreak of the present war, currency has been introduced into the United States through various channels. The English have had to leave some currency wherever they have made raids, and some has trickled into the hinterland from the coast towns where their armies have been stationed. Still more currency has been introduced in the hope of obtaining through corruption what force could not achieve. Much of it has also been spent by prisoners, the number of whom has rarely been small. Finally, the French troops have introduced some of it; and for some time now the Americans have been carrying on active trade with the Spaniards.

5. *Observations on the bill regulating the navigation of merchant ships in Virginia, 1784*

When Mazzei returned from Europe in the fall of 1783, he found that questions of commercial regulation were beginning to disturb the now independent country. At the end of April, 1784, Congress asked the state legislatures to vest in it the power to prohibit, for a term not to exceed fifteen years, the importation or exportation of goods in vessels owned by subjects of any country with which the United States did not have a commercial treaty; after Congress should be granted this authority, the resolution stipulated, the consent of nine states would be necessary for such a navigation act to go into effect.<sup>11</sup> In May the Virginia legislature passed an act giving Congress the power it desired,<sup>12</sup> but unqualified consent was not granted by all the states. Apparently while the congressional resolution was under discussion in 1784, Mazzei wrote a memorandum containing his reflections on regulation of trade on the four principal rivers of Virginia. He did not wish his views published until the citizens had been enlightened on the subject through an educational campaign sponsored by the Constitutional Society.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> W. C. Ford and others (eds.), *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (34 vols., 1904-1937), XXVI, 318-22.

<sup>12</sup> William W. Hening (ed.), *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia . . .* (13 vols., Richmond, 1809-1823), XI, 388-89.

<sup>13</sup> Mazzei, *Memoirs*, 285-86, n. 6.



Observations on the bill regulating the navigation of merchant ships in Virginia<sup>14</sup>

Laws may be defined as remedies or antidotes which aim to cure or prevent the evils of society. When administered as antidotes, they cause no disturbance, but when they are applied as preventive remedies they necessarily disturb the social organism, for, while they are working, they cause the organism to suffer more than it would have, had they not been applied at all. No change is ever effected without some inconvenience. In fact, the bad effects are always the first to be felt. This explains why most men, provided the evil grows gradually, naturally prefer to let it run its course. They do so either from want of courage to suffer the hardships, or because they do not realize the benefits that will result from the change. Tyranny is often the result of shameful and unpardonable indolence. The benefits accruing from our glorious Revolution are already numerous and great, and they will be still greater if only we know how, or, better, if only we resolve to make good use of them. But for some time we have had to suffer more serious evils than we would have had to suffer had we permitted the former abuses to continue.

It is an established axiom that perfection is not to be found in either good or evil. It is not to be supposed that everything that good laws abolish is bad, or that all they bring about is good. The wisdom of legislation consists in obtaining the most possible good, permitting only the necessary evils to continue. Necessary evils are those that cannot be avoided without incurring more serious ones. Among the necessary evils are the laws themselves, because they either forbid us to do certain things, or compel us to do certain others. Consequently, they deprive us of a certain amount of liberty, which is the greatest of all possessions. But what would happen if we had no laws? The weak, the good, and just would be oppressed by the wicked, the unjust, and the powerful, and the very shadow of security would vanish. Therefore, laws are necessary evils, because, while depriving us of a certain amount of liberty, they vouchsafe us the greater and better part of it. Furthermore, laws may be good or bad. Those laws are good wherein the good surpasses the evil; those are bad wherein the evil exceeds the good. My dear fellow citizens, beware of those who would have us believe that a law is bad because it works some hardships, for, as you have seen, these are unavoidable.

It seems to many persons that to prohibit ocean ships from making unrestricted use of rivers is most repugnant to our concept of liberty. But surely not to be free to dispose of the tobacco reaped on one's own land by the sweat of one's brow is still more repugnant. Everyone is obliged to bring his tobacco to public storehouses and expose it to the danger of being burned, if it is not of the required quality. This is certainly a serious hardship, and people must

<sup>14</sup> Mazzei, *Memorie*, II, 300-304. The date that this memorandum was written is uncertain, but, since it is mentioned in the letter to John Blair of May 12, 1785, which follows this document, it seems probable that it was written in 1784.

have felt very hard hit when the law was passed depriving one of the liberty to sell the tobacco to one's own houses, and stipulating further that it was to be burned if not perfect rather than sold at the price its inferior quality commanded, just as is done with other commodities. But the law was enacted, because it was believed, for well-known reasons, that it would be to the interest of the public. The law is still in force; yet no complaints are heard, even though it not only deprives one of the liberty of disposing of the fruit of one's labor, but exposes one to the danger of losing it altogether. I do not mean to approve of the law in every respect. In fact it seems to me that we can achieve the desired purpose without having to burn the tobacco. Since there are three trade qualities, for which there are three corresponding warehouses in each county (distinguishable from one another by the different trademarks), if the tobacco that is brought to the storehouse of the first class is not good enough, it should be allowed to be taken to one of the second class, and even to one of the third class; and if it should not deserve even the mark of the third, it should be returned to the proprietor, for (since it will bear no mark whatever) it will be sufficient to show the prospective buyer that it does not even meet the requirements of the third quality.

Some men believe that a law which would place restrictions on the liberal use of rivers would be tyrannical. A law enacted by a majority of the people's representatives can be bad, but not tyrannical, provided they do not exceed the power vested in them. And to determine whether it is good or bad, one must examine all the advantages and disadvantages that will result therefrom in order to see which will predominate.

The merchants who cause trade to thrive are, all over the world, those who buy, sell, export and import merchandise wholesale and who do not concern themselves with the retail trade. I have been informed by travelers with whom I have discussed this subject that Virginia, of all countries known to them, is the only one that has no such merchants. Here, a merchant must also be a storekeeper; and a storekeeper, a merchant. Since the merchant and storekeeper are one and the same person, it is thought that the buyer can purchase and merchandise at a better price than if the profit were to be divided between two persons. Nothing could be more fallacious. Under the present system, a large capital is required even for a modest deal. If it is true that our merchant-shopkeepers generally have little or no capital, it must mean one of two things: either that the owner is in another country and our merchants are mere shop clerks; or that they carry on business with someone else's capital and consequently at a greater disadvantage to us, since, in that case, they will sell at a higher price. The inconveniences are many, the expenses heavy, and many articles remain unsold for a long time, because it is not always possible to foresee the amount of the sales, and the shop must of necessity be well stocked. Thus, to be able to carry on, the profits of a person who is both shopkeeper and merchant must be very large. I hear it said everywhere that a thirty per cent profit would

hardly be enough to make them break even. I am persuaded that it is so. However, it is also certain that if the business were divided, fifteen per cent would be enough for both. In such a case, the shopkeeper will not need large storehouses nor many employees, and a small capital is sufficient, because he not only does not order merchandise from distant countries, but also buys only the merchandise which he needs from time to time. Since he can always get new supplies from the merchants, he buys no more than he can sell in a short time. Thus by placing his capital in circulation several times a year, his profit of ten per cent is probably equivalent to one of forty per cent for the person who is both shopkeeper and merchant.

As in all businesses and professions, it follows that the greater the division of the various tasks, the more easily, better, and more cheaply are things made.

Looking at it from the point of view of the merchant, all the leading traders of England, Holland, Germany, France, and Italy agree that they would become too rich if they earned three per cent net profit on all their sales. Strange as this may seem at first sight, it will be easily understood if it is only examined without prejudice. It must be remembered that in a very active market a merchant can buy and sell each year merchandise valued at three or four hundred thousand pounds sterling, although he may only possess ten thousand pounds. The dealer does not only sell what he himself has ordered from foreign countries, but also what is sent to him on commission, and he has frequent opportunities to buy and sell, in a very short time, merchandise sent by distant speculators. It not infrequently happens that a merchant sells a very valuable shipment in such a short time that he is able to pay for it with the drafts on those to whom he has sold it, and sometimes even before it is unloaded. In such a case, he even saves the expense of having it first stored and then removed from the storehouse. In these cases one and one-half per cent represents a large profit. Such merchants can exist only in large commercial markets, and these same markets cannot exist in Virginia as long as the present system prevails.

This system was probably inevitable in the early European settlements in this section of the country. In some states local conditions have brought about the remedy imperceptibly. In Virginia this cannot happen without legislation, because we have been especially favored by nature with an immense river, having many tributaries, some being almost 150 miles long.

All good things may become bad through abuse. Extensive river navigation is certainly a great benefit. Few other advantages can contribute as much to making a country rich and powerful. But, like all other good things, it must be used wisely. But to do so, it must be limited to ocean ships, and the number of boats and small vessels that only sail inland must be increased as much as possible. A few persons believe, and many others state that if merchandise is unloaded in a single emporium, and transported up and down the rivers by small ships, the expenses would be greater than if the transoceanic ships were permitted to go inland as far as possible. The truth is that pilot charges, which

depend on the depth of the ships, are responsible for the loss of time, due chiefly to the difficulty and danger of navigating up and down the rivers (where the depth of the water often changes from place to place), and that the want of facilities for loading, unloading, and repairing the ships exceed by far what it would cost to hire small ships. Furthermore, one must take into consideration the wear and tear of the ships which remain idle in the rivers for such a long time. The necessary facilities are to be found only where stevedores, boatmen, and mechanics can hope to obtain steady work, and where merchants can engage in good trade with those ships that carry considerable merchandise.

Without an emporium there can be no merchant-capitalists; without these merchants one cannot have his own ships; without ships there can be no sailors; and without sailors we would always be exposed to injury not only from powerful enemies, but also from pirates. Besides, there is the disadvantage of having to conduct trade by means of foreign ships. The proposed regulation aims to make it easier to obtain sailors, also because the large numbers of boats, small boats, and shallops which will soon be built under the protection of the new system, will be greatly increased. The boatmen are initiated in the art of seafaring. The sea is more easily accessible by water than by land. At the beginning there will probably be delays and other minor difficulties, but soon the advantages will make themselves felt. Inland communication, which is now, to our shame and detriment, more difficult between rivers than between Europe and ourselves, will be greatly facilitated. The chances of communication will be certain, frequent, and inexpensive, since (the convenience inducing men to travel even for minor needs and to exchange readily things which are now often desired but seldom obtained) there will be boats that will go from one place to another frequently and with regularity. The owners of these boats, for their own interest, will endeavor to give complete satisfaction both as to punctuality and rates.

It is said that English and Scotch merchants in Virginia are against the proposed regulation, and that they, better than anyone else, are in a position to know what can help or harm commerce. Reasons rather than opinions should guide us in our actions. But if I were to make up my mind on the basis of what they say, I would decide to do just the opposite. It is probable that they know what can help or harm commerce; but it is still more probable that they are merely suggesting what may be beneficial to themselves, and not what may be to our best interest, and much less will they desire to promote our interest if it is counter to their own. If, through the proposed regulation, commerce were properly managed to our advantage, the majority, if not all of these men, who depend on the credit the merchants and manufacturers of Great Britain extend to them, would be reduced to insignificance. And it is probable that all of them, including those permanently settled here and who are property owners, desire to see all the other nations excluded from having commercial relations with us, and the monopoly placed again entirely in the hands of Great Britain. This will

be the natural consequence unless the system is changed. As long as the present conditions prevail, the merchants of other countries not only will not come to settle among us, but will also be forced to stop making speculative deals, since they will lose in all, as they have in the past. Oftentimes merchandise has reached here on account of speculators which has been sold at a great loss notwithstanding the fact that it was adapted to the needs of the country, and that there was a demand for it. More than once I have been a witness to such a phenomenon, which is due to the want of a trading center, and consequently of merchants who are in a position to make large purchases.

In order that the speculator may sell at a profit, there must be a sufficient number of such merchants. But we, on the contrary, have none. Besides finding it unprofitable to invest large sums of money, even if they had it, in one or several articles, shopkeepers, whenever they see a speculator forced, after having lost much time and money, to sell at almost any price, take advantage of the opportunity to their exclusive profit and benefit, for they retail the merchandise at the same price as they would have charged had they paid the prevailing price. It is true that some of our citizens, and especially those nearer to the towns, have had the opportunity of buying various things at unusually low prices, and especially at public auction. But this cannot continue, because the repeated losses are so discouraging that overabundance must of necessity give way to scarcity. Whence it follows that these rare opportunities, which would not be desirable even if they were general, are restricted only to a small number of persons.

As for good merchants from France, Italy, Holland, or Germany coming to settle among us, or even sending their agents, we have in vain explained to them, both orally and in writing, our special method of conducting business, which to the great detriment of our country offers merchants a much larger profit than they could secure elsewhere. They cannot adjust themselves to the business of a shopkeeper, and especially to the sale of a large number of small articles. This is not even done by British merchants, excepting the manufacturers, but even they sell only what they manufacture. Some merchants would gladly settle here from many parts of Europe, or would at least send us their associates, if only there were a marketing center which would enable them to carry on wholesale trade in those commodities easily accessible to them, without being forced to deal in nearly all articles of human use or consumption.

If there were a marketing center from which large quantities of the same commodity could be distributed through many channels, we would have vessels coming from every country with the merchandise it produces more cheaply than any other country, and sometimes with only those cargoes that a speculator may deem likely to have special advantages. The necessity of importing all kinds of commodities at the same time causes a considerable financial burden, especially because many articles are had indirectly through third and fourth parties. Manufacturers produce only what falls within their specialty; and merchants, to fill their orders in full, are often forced to call on small retailers for

goods which they themselves have in stock. They do this because it would not be worth their while to open crates and undo bales to take out small quantities of these commodities. We must not lose sight of the fact that every increase in price is finally charged against the consumer.

As for the sending here of agents to open shops in various places, just as the English do, not only we ourselves should endeavor to put a stop to a practice so harmful to the state, but it would in no way be profitable to the merchants of other countries because they would have to compete with rivals who, besides knowing the language, are already established and well rooted in every corner of the country and possess full knowledge of a unique trade entirely new to all others as well as the character and resources of the inhabitants. In short, they have every possible advantage to thwart the undertakings of others.

Among the advantages which they [the British merchants] possess, to the great detriment of our country, is their insidious way of intervening by pretending to help anyone who has not ready cash to pay for what he needs, and whom they often persuade to buy on credit, whereas he could very well wait until after he had reaped and sold his crops, and buy for cash. In this manner, little by little he is taken by the neck, compelled to pledge his future harvests, and reduced to such a state of dependency that often he has not even the courage to ask for the prices of the things he purchases. By using the same practices, British merchants in Portugal had brought things to such a pass that the government, about the year 1770, was obliged to enact measures to prevent them in the future from depriving the inhabitants of a considerable portion of the fruits of their land and labor. This is a practice that the other nations cannot or will not adopt. It is certain that they have found the way of enabling the French financiers often to obtain our tobacco more cheaply from England than from us directly. It is not easy to lay bare all the fine points of this mysterious trickery; but it is easy to understand that we are the ones to suffer for it. Nor is it difficult to realize that all this tends to deprive us of cash, and that if we do not do away with this monopoly, which is growing daily, the ruin of our country is inevitable.

Those who are trying to insinuate that the proposed regulation would be strange and an unheard-of one say that there is no country in Europe which does not try to promote inland navigation as much as possible. It is true that wherever the advantages of free trade are known, no trouble nor expense is spared to facilitate it. But all ships used for foreign commerce are everywhere obliged to unload and load (at least as far as I have been able to see in France, Holland, Italy, and Turkey) in places designated by law, just as we are trying to have in our own country.

It would perhaps be difficult, if not impossible, to trace the beginnings of many of those trading centers; that is, whether the establishment of ports induced men to go and live there, or whether the cities already established and the size of their population induced the legislators to designate them as ports.

It is certain, however, that in some places the larger ships could sail further inland and the smaller ships even further still, but that both have to load and unload in places designated by law.

The legislators, after having considered all the circumstances, must have fixed the ports in places they deemed most convenient. In no country have I seen more than one port on the same river; and I have seen in almost all the above-mentioned countries many places that could have been and could still be ports, if the only requirement were a convenient location for loading and unloading. Our commerce demands that only one port be designated for the present, and that it be situated in the most convenient place so that from there the merchandise may be shipped by way of all the rivers. However, since it is generally believed that a considerable portion of the commerce would be lost if we did not have a port on the Potomac, it seems necessary to establish two. I am convinced that the proposal of establishing five will not be carried, and I hope that after careful consideration the plan of establishing one on each important river will also be abandoned. Our present conditions cannot give life to four ports as readily as is desired. Hence the inevitable hardships that accompany any change would last longer and probably be more serious. The long delay of the hoped-for advantages, too, might be so exasperating as to cause new and harmful resolutions. In order to have a port in each of the four principal rivers we must wait until our country is populated proportionately to its area.

Some are of the opinion that if you permit things to take their natural course, the inconveniences will remedy themselves. This maxim is generally true, but when a bad principle has introduced an evil, which long usage has strengthened and many wish to maintain, prudence requires that the cure should not be left to natural causes, because in such a case they work too slowly, and sometimes are unable to work at all unless assisted by legislation.

The subject of the excise tax deserves serious consideration. As I have tried to show by word of mouth and in writing, I have always thought it to be a great social evil. Our legislators either have not considered it so or have considered it an evil necessary in our present condition, since we have had this tax for several years and it has recently been increased. Therefore, an effort should at least be made to secure the benefits expected of it with the least possible harm.

Excise taxes naturally tend to make men use their wits to deceive the public for their own benefit, even where these taxes are levied in the least objectionable way. With our present system of foreign commerce we open the door to fraud, and show it the smooth, straight, and easy path to have its fill, without risk and inconvenience; at the same time, we only partially burden the honest people to enable them to resist the powerful temptations of self-interest. To expect the collection of excise taxes with the slightest semblance of apportionment in a country where merchandise, after having been declared, may be unloaded at any point whatsoever is so absurd a thing in the mind of persons who have

thought over the subject and who have some knowledge of mankind that I deem it superfluous to take it up here.

6. *Letter to John Blair, President of the Constitutional Society, 1785*

Another subject in which Mazzei was keenly interested, after his return from Europe, was the organization of the Constitutional Society. Some members of the Virginia legislature proposed to revise the state's constitution, but others, Mazzei wrote, "feared that by jumping out of the frying pan they would fall into the fire." In an effort to find a satisfactory solution to the problem, he proposed the formation of the Constitutional Society to discuss privately and beforehand all subjects that were to be considered by the legislature. He relates that his fellows wished to make him president of the Society, but he refused because of his plan to return to Europe after reporting on his mission. His own nominee, John Blair, was unanimously chosen. Mazzei attended several meetings of the Society at Blair's home in Williamsburg and found them a source of satisfaction. The following letter to President Blair was written on May 12, 1785, while Mazzei was a guest at the home of Mann Page on the Rappahannock.<sup>15</sup>

Mazzei to Blair<sup>16</sup>

Mr. John Blair, President of the Constitutional Society

Dear Sir:

In my last letter I said that I should soon write you on the subject of our Society. When I think of the enormous benefit the nation may derive from such an organization, I cannot help wishing earnestly that the members who compose it seriously resolve to fulfill their pledge. There is still much to be done before our government can achieve that degree of perfection which is necessary to protect the interests and honor of our country and to preserve liberty for our descendants. The same persons who last year opposed the calling of a convention to correct these imperfections, though admitting that there are a great many of them, were opposed to a convention only because they feared to make matters worse. I shared this fear, and I am still of the opinion that it would be wrong to take action before the people are sufficiently informed of the danger which we face because of these imperfections, and before they are made aware of the

<sup>15</sup> Mazzei, *Memoirs*, 285-86, n. 6.

<sup>16</sup> Mazzei, *Memorie*, II, 296-99.



only means of correcting them. Once this is accomplished, the people will at once call on those citizens who are willing to carry out, and capable to perfect this great undertaking.

The people will follow the straight road, whenever it is pointed out to them. The present unfortunate state of affairs results from their being easily led astray by the ignorance or malice of a few, since the good and wise (who constitute here a larger percentage than in any other civilized nation I know of) are averse to using their voice and pen to enlighten those of their fellow citizens who were unable to get an academic education. Moreover, it seems to me that in a truly free country, where national prosperity and happiness stand on the same foundation for everyone, the uneducated portion of the inhabitants has a right to be enlightened and advised by the educated citizens, just as a child is by his father.

Our Society was founded solely with this aim in view. We promised it to each other, to our fellow citizens, and to the world. There can be no excuse for us if we fail. Fully aware as we were of the importance of our aim, we were not satisfied merely to feel (as every honest person does) favorably disposed toward public welfare. We pledged our honor to make every possible effort to bring this welfare about.

When the people see a number of respected citizens (among them many of the greatest persons now living in our country) all taken up with the task of enlightening them (in which task they can have no other interest than the noble satisfaction of making use of their talents in the support of liberty), they will not only be comforted and grateful, but in all matters that are difficult to understand they will prefer the opinion of these citizens to that of certain persons who heretofore have often succeeded in leading them astray.

Every country will always have regulations that are necessary for the public welfare, which will furnish selfish rascals the means of deceiving a goodly number of well-intentioned citizens. The reason for this is that the unavoidable inconveniences that result from any change are immediately seen and felt, whereas the good effects that result therefrom, even though much more important than the inconveniences, cannot be foreseen except by a few, for they are generally remote and brought about by a variety of causes. A case in point is the question of whether it is proper for our State to have only one or two seaports for its imports and exports.

A worthy member of our Society had me promise to send him my views on this subject before my departure, but I should not like them published before the Society has had a chance to make its purpose known through the public press and to accustom the people to seek rather than simply receive their instruction.

Allow me to beg you (as strongly as I can and know how) to point out at the first meeting the necessity and the duty of being active, and to set the example yourself. I am now going far from my adopted country, but when I return, as I hope, I do not believe that the present imperfections in our govern-

ment can produce, during my lifetime, the inconveniences we dread. But I look upon the citizens of tomorrow as my own children, and even were I to go to live and die in China, I should always be happy to contribute to the establishment of an asylum for oppressed humanity. I should not like my own shortcomings to serve as an excuse. I know that I would have done my duty and fulfilled my promises, and of this you may be sure.

At the first meeting I wish you would propose that honorary membership be extended to foreigners. If the proposal is carried, I should like to have word of it before sailing from New York, for I plan (if it is agreeable to the Society) to offer membership in the Society to the Duke de la Rochefoucauld of Paris, Marquis [di] Beccaria of Milan, Signor [Felice] Fontana of Florence, Signor [Lazzaro] Spallanzani of Bologna,<sup>17</sup> and to all others to whom the Society will authorize me to extend the same invitation. I have the honor to be, with every respect and esteem,

Yours, etc. etc.

Mansfield, May 12, 1785.

P. S. Mr. Mann Page plans to come to the first meeting and to propose Mr. John Minor, who has assured me that if he is granted the honor of being received as a member of our Society, he will never fail in his duty. In the event that some unexpected accident prevents Mr. Page from coming, I beg you to propose Mr. Minor, saying to our fellow members that I knew him as a college student and after his graduation, and that I have always had reason to believe him a talented, learned, and worthy young man.

<sup>17</sup> It is not known whether any of these men actually became members.

## Book Reviews

*Paths to the Present.* By Arthur M. Schlesinger. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. Pp. [x], 317. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

The educated layman frequently directs certain criticisms at the professional historian: his writing is too pedestrian; he encumbers his pages with footnotes; he is overcautious in finding a pattern in and drawing conclusions from his facts; he is too hesitant about using the past to forecast the future.

None of these strictures applies to Professor Schlesinger's book of essays. His style is lucid, brisk, and enlivened with neat turns of phraseology. There are no footnotes, but as "a gesture in extenuation" there is an extensive and partially critical bibliography. Further, the reader may find elsewhere a footnoted version of about half of the thirteen essays. Three of the essays are entirely new. The others are reprinted, with varying degrees of amplification or condensation, from such diverse sources as *Life* and the *American Historical Review*, with scholarly publications heavily dominant.

Professor Schlesinger is intent upon finding patterns—or exploring paths—in American history. Each of the essays is an interpretive study tracing some trait, influence, or problem through the whole time span of American life. The institutional view is equally broad, for social, economic, political, and diplomatic facets of the American experience are considered. Political and diplomatic emphases bulk larger in this book than in the author's *New Viewpoints in American History*, from which two essays reappear in a new guise.

The American, the author believes, was indeed a "new man," a product of the interaction of the Old World heritage and New World conditions. He was marked by sobriety, diligence, self-reliance, versatility, mechanical ingenuity, scorn for the specialist, indifference to artistic beauty, increased respect for women, geographical and social mobility, an optimistic belief in progress, "a conception of democracy rigorously qualified by individualism." This individualism caused rejection of too great governmental restraint but fostered voluntary association, which has "afforded the people their best schooling in self-government." These traits were somewhat altered by a changed pattern of immigration in the late nineteenth century and by the increasing impact of the city. An urban interpretation, Professor Schlesinger maintains, is the valid second half to the American picture for which Frederick Jackson Turner provided the first half. An essay is devoted to establishing the premise that food is "the most basic of all" clues to the American past.

The presidents of the United States are ranked according to the well-publicized *Life* poll of the experts, whose names are listed. Attention is given to

the "Persisting Problems of the Presidency," problems not in the exercise of the executive function but in such matters as selection, tenure, longevity.

America has been part of one world in that the main themes of American history and the "great transforming factors in Western European history" have been the same—"democracy, nationalism, industrialism, imperialism and humanitarianism." Nor has the United States been a nation apart in the military sense: World War II should be recognized as World War IX. Certain popular axioms are refuted: that the founding fathers advised perpetual isolationism; that this policy has permitted the nation to be "master of its own fate"; that in war the enemy has been always speedily defeated.

Professor Schlesinger is concerned with prophecy. He devotes one essay to assessing some of our past seers, concluding that as a warning men predict what they fear or as a guide they predict what they desire. In another essay the author assumes the robe of prophet, using the past to plot the alternating periods of liberalism and conservatism in national politics. Admitting there are factors which may alter the rhythm, he suggests that the "recession from liberalism" which began in 1947 will end around 1962 and the next conservative period will begin around 1978.

The separate consideration and perhaps overstressing in individual essays of the significance to American life of the associative impulse, of immigration, of urbanism, of food, leaves the reader wishing for another essay in which the author seeks to integrate and balance the main forces in his concept of multiple causation. Nor do these major forces seem in harmony with the explanation of cause ascribed to the alternating conservative-liberal tides in national politics—psychological factors like boredom and vexation, "subjective influences . . . springing from something basic in human nature."

Occasionally an illustration selected to elucidate a trend seems a little forced. For example, the Mexican War falls within a conservative period, so the "land-grabbing" and proslavery angle is stressed, though conservative New England interests were opposed. World War I, within a liberal period, was a war to promote world democracy, though "liberal" pacifists opposed it and big business interests supported it, doubtless on grounds other than sheer altruism. Other details may be questioned: Did the fifteenth-century Ottoman conquest of Asia Minor endanger the trade routes to the Orient? Did the South in the 1840's remain "immune" to temperance agitation? Did not Chicago even more than St. Louis regard the Kansas-Nebraska Act as a step toward victory in the trans-continental railroad rivalry?

The historian will find useful those essays that are convenient summaries of current research. And he will join the layman in approving Professor Schlesinger's willingness to suggest at times not only what *has* happened but what *should* take place in American life.

Emory University

JAMES HARVEY YOUNG

*A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860. Volume I, European Inheritances.* Edited by Edgar W. Knight. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. xii, 744. \$12.50.)

The historic backwardness of the South in some aspects of education has led to the widespread assumption that it gave little attention to education in any respect at all. This assumption, however, has been gradually crumbling of late, as histories of southern colleges and universities and of general educational activities in southern colonies and states have appeared. So far there has been no monumental historical narrative on education in the South, but the way is being made easier by the project of a five-volume documentary history, the first volume of which has now been published and is the subject of this review.

As the title indicates, this work has been limited to the period before 1860, for thereafter the material is so varied and diffuse that it seemed hardly practicable to attempt to make a selection and, too, educational developments in this later period conform more nearly to the present situation. The period of this first volume begins with the founding of Virginia and continues down through the Revolution, and in some instances further on to a more logical turn or stopping place. In at least one instance the story is continued down to the present—that of the Syms-Eaton Fund; and by the same logic the story of another institution, the Bethesda Orphan House, could likewise have been brought down to date, for this oldest orphan school in the United States continues in operation.

Education in colonial times partook largely of its European origins; yet with the passing of time new conditions in America began to have their diverging effects. At first the schoolmasters were the ministers and missionaries sent over from England, largely by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and they made their educational efforts adjuncts to their churches. But the colonists did not continue long to depend on the bounty of England; as people accumulated wealth, they set up educational endowments such as the Syms-Eaton Fund in Virginia, and certain taxes were applied to education as in the case of the support of the College of William and Mary, or the colonial government gave support through grants of land as in the case of the Bethesda Orphan House in Georgia. Also philanthropic and benevolent societies were organized to promote education, so well illustrated in colonial South Carolina; and, of course, well-to-do planters secured private tutors for their children. So the southern colonies by no means were oblivious of the advantages of education and of their obligations to promote it. Provision was made for the establishment of Henrico College in Virginia in 1619, and had it not been for the Indian massacre three years later and the revocation of the Virginia charter shortly thereafter, this institution would doubtless have taken on life and thereby have antedated Harvard University. Even so, the chartering of the College of William and Mary in 1693 gave the South the second oldest college in the

United States. And as subsequent volumes in this work will show, the South pioneered in setting up the first state university and also the first college for women which granted degrees.

The story, as here suggested, is told in this volume of a thousand documents, actually so. That being true, then, a great many of them perforce are short, some even as short as four lines. But thereby space is left for some rather long documents, as, for example, the Charter and Statutes of the College of William and Mary, more than forty pages long, and an even longer extract from the diary and letters of Philip V. Fithian, a superb social and educational document which is as entrancingly interesting as the William and Mary Charter is dull. But it might be noted that for some purposes dull documents are more important than sprightly ones, and since this volume has a generous supply of both, it qualifies as a handy reference work as well as source of entertaining reading. This whole work of five volumes will not only then be a documentary collection useful for the researcher in the history of education, but also a valuable source book of collateral readings for students studying social and educational history.

As Professor Knight, the editor of this work, was well aware, the selection of the documents was a task which was to some extent arbitrary; but this reviewer is not inclined to quarrel with him, but rather to compliment him on the all-inclusiveness of his choices. The editor's wide acquaintance with educational history, both as author and teacher, led him into many sources which would not have suggested themselves to a person less a master of the field. These documents came from laws, journals, letters, diaries, missionary and educational reports, and similar materials. Indeed, some of these documents were located only in manuscript, and there is almost a certainty that these are here published for the first time. The further skill of Professor Knight is seen in his "Preview and Comments," generally two or three pages in length, which introduces each of the fifteen sets of documents into which he has grouped the whole. This documentary history is an outstanding accomplishment of the pre-eminent authority on the educational history of the South.

University of Georgia

E. M. COULTER

*Problems of Church and State in Maryland During the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* By Albert Warwick Werline. (South Lancaster, Mass.: The College Press, [c. 1948]. Pp. x, 236. Bibliographical note. \$3.00.)

When a new title on a significant topic appears, readers might properly expect a penetrating study or a work of bold and generous outline. Unfortunately the author of this volume has missed an opportunity to do a genuine service for our colonial history by giving us neither. Timidly clinging to overabundant footnotes (955 for 211 brief pages of text), he has chosen the technique of a detailed factual account for a subject which is better illuminated by treatment

of the principles. As a consequence "the facts speak" but do not inform those generalizations necessary to define the structure of the work with clarity.

This indefiniteness is aggravated by the author's failure to make his points concisely. At the outset we are told that Lord Baltimore, though actuated partly by a religious motive in his colonizing activities, could not depend on members of his own faith to accomplish his purpose. But we are left uncertain about what this purpose was. Later (p. 155) some doubt arises in the description of the proceedings of the revolutionary government which, the author says, "made no advance beyond the province's traditional toleration" in the matter of religious liberty. It is not clear whether he regards the double tax on Catholics, the prohibition on the public exercise of their religion, and the injunction against erecting Catholic churches as indicative of toleration or whether he is simply ignoring this evidence presented earlier in his study.

A more damaging fault occurs in the section following page 137 where the argument is premised on an error in fact. In order to show that church affiliation had no decisive influence on voting in the revolutionary Convention, the author examines the votes cast by several Anglican members and by two Catholics, Charles Carroll of Carrollton and Charles Carroll, barrister. The latter was, however, a Protestant, a member of St. Anne's parish in Annapolis where he served as vestryman and churchwarden. The error invalidates the whole demonstration.

It is as difficult as it is necessary to differentiate the five prominent Charles Carrolls of eighteenth-century Maryland. In the index to this volume the author makes no distinction between the signer of a petition to the upper house of the assembly in 1706 (Charles Carroll, the immigrant, progenitor of a line of Catholic Carrolls) and a second Charles, who was his son and the father of the most celebrated in the succession, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. To complicate matters another set of Charles Carrolls flourished during the same century. Originally Catholic, the first of these, Charles Carroll, surgeon, was converted to the Anglican Church and elevated to a position of leadership in Maryland politics once his religious disabilities were removed. His son, Charles Carroll, barrister, here mistaken for a Catholic, was a prominent figure in the Maryland revolutionary movement. The members of these two mutually antagonistic families occupy a significant place in political, constitutional, and social developments in the seventy-five years preceding the Revolution. It is therefore surprising to find confusion on matters which should be familiar to students of eighteenth-century Maryland.

The first five chapters covering church-state relationships through the independence movement constitute the most important part of Dr. Werline's book. Here he sets forth the evolution of the establishment, gives an account of sectarian rivalries, and, in the most important chapter, brings out some of the difficulties that developed in the relations of church and state during the years before the Revolution. Once the crisis ending in separation from England is

passed, one feels the author is beating the bushes for small game. The discussion becomes arid and somewhat futile, attempting to project into a new era a problem whose terms had changed. In the post-independence period the severity of Jefferson's crusade in Virginia is absent. Minor polemics advocating tax-supported churches in the new state of Maryland never added up to a grass-roots movement.

Without quibbling over minute distinctions in the classification of materials in a bibliography which shows very wide reading, it may be pointed out that items in Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History* and in Hall's *Narratives of Early Maryland* are not magazine articles.

If, like Lewis Carroll's Duchess, one sees morals in all situations, surely the one here is plain. Any historian, great or small, may profit from timely advice and criticism of specialists who examine their manuscripts before publication. Students of Maryland history are fortunate that staff members of institutions in the state are eminently qualified by training and occupation to offer such aid. Most important, they are eager to be of service.

Carnegie Institute of Technology

AUBREY C. LAND

*Captain Dauntless: The Story of Nicholas Biddle of the Continental Navy.*

By William Bell Clark. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949. Pp. xii, 317. Illustrations, appendixes, bibliography, notes. \$4.50.)

Had fortune been more kind, Nicholas Biddle might well share honors with John Paul Jones in the annals of early American naval history. As it is, his name is familiar only to naval students; in fact, even in multivolumed histories of our navy, his exploits are usually condensed into a few paragraphs. William Bell Clark feels that Biddle's "deeds deserve better public appreciation than ever has been accorded them" and by this biography hopes to secure for him "greater recognition in American naval history."

Biddle's life is full of interest, color, romance, and danger up to his early, tragic death. Next to the youngest in a family of nine and fatherless at six, young Nicholas was at sea by fourteen and a survivor of shipwreck by fifteen. He served a year as midshipman in the British Navy and accompanied Captain Phipps on his polar expedition in 1773. Back in London, he learned of the projected expedition of the Royal Society to the Southern Ocean, and at once made application to Sir Joseph Banks for service on the trip. At this juncture, however, news of the Boston Tea Party reached England. Sensing the probable British punitive action and the well-nigh certain American resistance, Biddle returned his midshipman's warrant to the British Admiralty and embarked for Philadelphia in the spring of 1774.

Nicholas Biddle was ready for action should it come, and perhaps was eager for it; not yet twenty-four years of age, he had had a sea experience and a



military training which were generally lacking among colonial seamen of his day.

With the opening of hostilities, Biddle served four months with his state navy (Pennsylvania) before he joined the Continental Navy in January, 1776. Here he was given command of the *Andrew Doria*, one of the five vessels in the first Continental fleet. On the third and final cruise, lasting five weeks, the *Andrew Doria* took six prizes. Even before this cruise, however, Biddle had so signally demonstrated his ability that he had been promised a 32-gun frigate. On February 6, 1777, the *Randolph*, Biddle in command, cleared the Delaware waters, the first of the thirteen newly built frigates to reach the sea. She quickly showed faulty construction and cheap timbers in her masts; in fact, she sprung her foremast and completely lost her topmast which towered 150 feet above the gun deck. It was with difficulty that she made port at Charleston, South Carolina. Over five months elapsed before repairs were completed. Scarcely a week out on her second cruise, the *Randolph* ran into the Jamaica fleet and took two ships and two brigs richly laden with sugar and rum. This was profitable war! Records show the cargo was valued at £90,000, and Biddle in command undoubtedly received a tenth.

The *Randolph* and her crew again spent some weeks at Charleston. During these sojourns at this southern port, young "Captain Dauntless" mingled with the best of Charleston society. He seemingly endeared himself to all and especially to one Elizabeth Elliott Baker. And this charming young lady of eighteen in turn captivated Biddle's affections. Beyond doubt they were engaged; Biddle named her first in his will made in January, 1778. They were, however, never married.

The *Randolph* left for her next—and final—cruise in February. Off the Barbados, late in the afternoon of March 7, she sighted sails in the distance; and she was also sighted. Visibility was poor. Biddle probably expected a 28-gun frigate; when the vessels came within hail about 8 p.m., it was discovered that the enemy was the *Yarmouth*, a two-decker, 64-gun ship of the line. Despite the odds, in the early moments of the engagement the advantage lay with the *Randolph*. Biddle was shortly wounded in the thigh, but propped in a chair on the quarter-deck, he continued to direct and encourage his crew. Then came that fatal moment when perhaps a shot or spark touched the *Randolph's* magazine and she blew up. Five days later the *Yarmouth* picked up from a piece of wreckage four survivors of a crew of 315. Nicholas Biddle was not one of them.

Such in brief is the story of Nicholas Biddle. He was skilled in his profession as few of his day were and proved himself a capable and courageous young officer. His early death surely robbed him of greater and wider fame and deprived his country of the services of one of its very few competent sea commanders in its crucial struggle for independence.

Mr. Clark, though by vocation an advertiser, has long made the study of the Continental Navy his avocation. This is his third biography of the period. Re-

search appears exhaustive; footnotes are adequate but unfortunately are placed at the back of the book; organization is simple and straightforward; composition is able and lively, occasionally fictionalized but a "perhaps" or a "probably" warns the reader; illustrations are appropriate and format attractive. This reviewer believes Mr. Clark has done his part in bringing "greater recognition" to this Revolutionary naval officer.

University of Oklahoma

WILLIAM E. LIVEZEY

*Andrew Stevenson: Democrat and Diplomat, 1785-1857.* By Francis Fry Wayland. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949. Pp. xiv, 290. Frontispiece, map, chronology, bibliography. \$4.00.)

Professor Wayland has succeeded in rescuing from biographical oblivion an imposing and influential figure of American history. Andrew Stevenson was not another Jackson, Clay, Calhoun, or Webster. Yet during an eventful period he was speaker of the House of Representatives for seven years and minister to England for five years. Wayland's volume is a scholarly, well-balanced, and judicious biography of a Virginian of near-great stature who has too long been neglected by historians of the middle period.

Although the son of a conservative Anglican clergyman, young Stevenson readily absorbed the liberal tenets of French rationalism and Jeffersonian Republicanism while a student at William and Mary College in the late 1790's. After a brief though meteoric career at the Richmond bar, Stevenson entered the Virginia House of Delegates in 1809 at the age of twenty-four. Here he served as Richmond's representative for most of the next decade, with time out for creditable service as major in the Virginia militia during the War of 1812. For five sessions (1812-1816) Stevenson was speaker of the House of Delegates. While in the state legislature he became a member of the Richmond Junto, the central corresponding committee of the Republican (Democratic) party, a powerful political clique which by exalting Jeffersonian principles virtually dominated politics in Virginia for thirty years.

Stevenson's service in Congress extended from 1821 through 1834. The Adams-Clay alignment of 1825, which killed Crawford's candidacy, drew Stevenson and other Virginians reluctantly into the Jackson camp. Stevenson's loyal party work and parliamentary skill brought him in 1827 the speakership of the House, a post which he held until his nomination as minister to England in 1834. As speaker he was no independent sponsor of legislation, like his brilliant predecessor Clay, but he was a competent party leader. By enforcing strict party discipline and making favorable committee appointments, he was instrumental in securing passage of most of the important Jacksonian measures.

His reward for these services was appointment in 1834 as minister to England. Bitter Whig opposition, caused by Stevenson's obvious loyalty and presumptive subservience to Jackson, delayed Senate approval of his appointment

until 1836. His five-year tenure as minister, which spanned the incumbency of four presidents, was marked by repeated controversies between Britain and America. Most important of these were the northeastern boundary dispute; American claims for slaves liberated by British colonial authorities; British insistence on the right to search alleged slave ships off the African coast flying the American flag; the *Caroline* and McLeod incidents; and tariff disputes. In all these affairs Stevenson proved capable if not brilliant as representative of American interests. He significantly laid much of the groundwork for the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842.

After his return to America in 1841 he officially retired from politics and lived the life of a gentleman farmer at Blenheim, his country estate in Albemarle County. He retained an active interest in affairs of the commonwealth, however, especially in education and in agriculture. His long service on the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia was capped by his election as rector in 1856. He was also an active charter member of the Virginia Agricultural Society, serving as its president in 1845.

Even in his so-called retirement from politics he remained an influential member of the Richmond Junto and helped map Democratic strategy for the state in the various presidential elections. He had considerable support for the Democratic nomination for vice-president in 1844 and was constantly urged to run for the Senate. Andrew Jackson, Thomas Ritchie, and others urged his appointment as Secretary of State by Polk in 1845. Stevenson missed being elected governor of Virginia by only one vote in the balloting of the state assembly in 1842. He was president of both the 1835 and 1848 Democratic national conventions.

A lifelong Democrat, Stevenson gave consistent support to the Jackson wing of the party when it was being rent asunder in Virginia by defections into Whig and state-rights groups over the nullification controversy of 1832. Yet he, like many of his southern colleagues, gradually shifted from Jacksonian nationalism to provisional secessionism. Stevenson's strong unionist sentiments slowly gave way before northern onslaughts on the South's peculiar institution. His closing years, as those of many of his contemporary Southerners, were shattered by an apprehension that the slavery question could be settled only by war.

Thorough documentation and careful evaluation characterize Professor Wayland's study. The importance of the book cannot be minimized by the fact that the style is not always engaging or by its failure to throw new light on internal Virginia politics of the period—a field which has been worked by Ambler and Simms but which offers further scope for investigation. This competent biography of Andrew Stevenson should be placed on the required reading list for all students of the middle period of American history.

Birmingham-Southern College

FRANCIS P. GAINES, JR.

*Lincoln and the Baltimore Plot, 1861: From Pinkerton Records and Related Papers.* Edited by Norma B. Cuthbert. (San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1949. Pp. xxiv, 161. Frontispiece, notes, bibliography. \$3.00.)

The seriousness of the threat to Lincoln's life when he passed through Baltimore on February 23, 1861, has been a subject of disagreement among historians. Basic to a true estimate of the situation in Baltimore is the credibility of Allan Pinkerton, discoverer of the alleged plot to assassinate Lincoln. Thus Miss Cuthbert has made a distinct contribution by publishing in full, for the first time, the reports of Pinkerton and his operatives together with other pertinent documents.

As is the case with so many other items of Lincolniana, we owe the preservation of Pinkerton's records to William H. Herndon. In 1866 he obtained Pinkerton's permission to make transcripts of the originals in the detective agency's files. In 1869 he sold these, together with copies of other Lincoln material, to Ward Hill Lamon, and they are now in the Lamon Collection at the Huntington Library. The originals were destroyed in the Chicago fire.

From the Pinkerton records it is evident that there were men in Baltimore quite willing to murder Lincoln and that they were organized after a fashion. Whether they had the courage and resourcefulness to consummate their purpose is a question which will never be resolved. It is abundantly proved, however, that Pinkerton was justified in taking measures for Lincoln's safety and that Lincoln was well advised to pass through Baltimore secretly.

An important product of Miss Cuthbert's research is her discovery of the reason for Ward Hill Lamon's belittling of the Baltimore peril in his biography of Lincoln and for his disparagement of Pinkerton; for those who have maintained the reality of Lincoln's danger have long been puzzled by the insinuation of Lamon, himself Lincoln's zealous protector throughout his journey from Springfield to Washington, that Pinkerton fabricated the plot as a means of self-glorification, and by his assertion that the detective's reports, which were in Lamon's possession at the time his book was written, were "neither edifying nor useful; they prove nothing but the baseness of the vocation which gave them existence." To be sure, these opinions are now known to have been expressed by Chauncey F. Black, Lamon's ghostwriter, rather than by Lamon himself, but they must have had his approval.

Miss Cuthbert finds the explanation in Lamon's personal animus toward Pinkerton, for the Pinkerton reports, together with other documents in the Lamon Collection, reveal that after Lincoln's safe arrival in Washington, Lamon was disposed to disclose the whole story to the press, making a great "splurge" for himself. But Pinkerton thought it of vital importance to his own future usefulness to the government that his part in the affair be kept secret. Furthermore, if the story were to be told, it was important to Lincoln's reputation that

it be told accurately. Consequently, Pinkerton compelled Lamon to hold his tongue, even threatening to take the matter to Lincoln when the Colonel proved obdurate. Lamon sullenly acquiesced, but he never forgave Pinkerton.

When Benson J. Lossing in his history of the Civil War printed a letter in which John A. Kennedy, superintendent of the New York police, took undue credit for his part in the Baltimore incident, Pinkerton published the story of his own exploit. He appealed to Lamon for confirmation, but the Colonel ignored his letters. Later, when Lamon acquired copies of Pinkerton's reports from Herndon and read where the detective described him as "a brainless, egotistical fool," his long-smoldering rage exploded. Acquiescence in Black's scornful account of the Baltimore plot and his cynical disparagement of Pinkerton afforded Lamon a measure of revenge.

Miss Cuthbert does not claim definitiveness for her scholarly study. Her research has been limited to the Huntington Library, where she is chief cataloguer of manuscripts, the New York Public Library, and the Library of Congress. But her skillful correlation of the most significant material bearing on the plot in text and footnotes leaves little of a worth-while nature to be done.

Springfield, Illinois

BENJAMIN P. THOMAS

*Florida's Flagler.* By Sidney Walter Martin. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1949. Pp. xii, 280. Illustrations, map, bibliography. \$4.00.)

*Florida's Flagler* is a fortunate title for Dr. Martin's biography of Henry Morrison Flagler. But as the narrative progresses, one wonders whether anything really possessed Flagler except the insatiable will to create that made him ruthless to those who blocked his path and frequently inept in the human relations of his intimate life.

The Flagler story is one of the "rags to riches" experiences which Americans observed repeatedly during the last half of the nineteenth century. Starting out at the age of fourteen with a few dollars in his pocket, Henry M. Flagler accumulated an estate of \$100,000,000 before his death at eighty-three. He accomplished this feat first of all by helping to fashion one of the largest industrial combines in this country, the Standard Oil Trust; indeed, he is generally regarded as its master architect. "Good business" demanded that everything be bent to his ends: individuals, competing companies, and state legislatures alike. The process was performed with some generosity and "cheerfulness"; that is, only those who refused to accept the domination of the "monster" trust were sent to the wall.

Once the gigantic organization was established and set upon its pleasing task of piling up more and yet more annual profits, Flagler lost interest in his economic offspring. Dr. Martin does not explain why, satisfactorily. Still in his early fifties, the millionaire found a new world to conquer, the Florida east coast, a sandy wilderness headed by the sleepy little town of St. Augustine and

extending to Key West. One palatial hotel after another unrolled the lush and gaudy elegance of the 1890's before the amazed and often hostile eyes of poor and backward Florida. Connecting the hotels was a railroad creeping down the coast and bringing into being community after community until it reached Fort Dallas, soon to become Miami. Not content with these exploits, Flagler dreamed his most daring venture, the overseas railway to Key West. This was a task which one engineer after another declared impossible and which only a determined gentleman with a bottomless money box could have brought to pass.

Under the Midas hand of Flagler, the Florida east coast enjoyed some twenty-five years of boom without bust. Even the vagaries of nature in the shape of blighting frost could not stop its stride, for to keep his projects moving Flagler worked to alleviate the human suffering and economic damage caused thereby.

Dr. Martin is most temperate in his treatment of Flagler himself, so temperate in fact that the force and color of the man are often dimmed. The author is also generous in his estimate of his character, more generous than many students of the Flagler activities are willing to be.

The book as a whole is a careful piece of research that fills a gap heretofore left empty, since there is no other adequate biography of Flagler. For Florida history, the volume tells the story of one of its most significant periods of growth. The Flagler enterprises saved the east coast from decades of unaided struggle; they pushed the region into the public mind not only as a winter playground but as a place of economic opportunities. To top it off, they made Florida fashionable.

Winter Park, Florida

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA

*Eleven Generals: Studies in American Command.* By Fletcher Pratt. (New York: William Sloane Associates, 1949. Pp. xviii, 355. Maps. \$5.00.)

In this book, *Eleven Generals: Studies in American Command*; Fletcher Pratt traces the development of the distinctive and original American contributions to the science of land warfare through the significant periods of the careers of eleven military commanders from Nathanael Greene in the American Revolution to Omar Bradley in World War II. Not everyone will agree on the choice made to illustrate the particular phase and period of development, and many will question the correctness of including no Confederate leader. It is suggested that there were at least two men, long associated as commander and subordinate, who did much by their aggressive fighting and tactical leadership on the field of battle to hold the line against increasing odds in the western theater—Lieutenant General William J. Hardee, corps commander in the Confederate Army of Tennessee, familiarly known as "Old Reliable," and Major General Patrick R. Cleburne, the "Stonewall Jackson of the West." In addition to these, General Jubal A. Early, who accomplished so much with so little, might be added.

This book illustrates in a forcible manner two major developments in warfare

that have taken place within the last fifty years and through both of which there are continually present at least two constant characteristics. Until recent years the citizen soldier, with aggressive qualities of leadership, skill in analysis, and a flair for organization and management, could and did don a uniform and lead his men to victory. The professional soldier, more often than not, was bound by tradition and frequently was devoid of organizing ability and of the power of inspiring leadership. The citizen soldier, usually with small bodies of troops, made up for this handicap by the unorthodox use of his forces. As the twentieth century approached with its dependence on the machine age and a resulting complication of the weapons of warfare and an increase in the size of armies from relatively small bodies of men, able and ready to go anywhere, to large armies, nations at war, handicapped in movement by problems of logistics, the requirements for high command became more difficult and exacting. Through all this change and complexity, however, the continuous thread has been the fire power and mobility of attacking infantry, the man on the ground with a gun in his hand. Artillery can demolish towns and fortifications, but it operates from fixed positions and at a distance; the airplane can damage or destroy large areas of cover, but its passage is in flight and it is tied to landing fields and bases of supply. The infantry, using both of these auxiliary arms, can advance into enemy territory and take and hold positions deemed necessary for military purposes. The ultimate power of infantry is the thread that holds this book together. From Nathanael Greene, the hit-and-run tactician, to Omar Bradley, the trained and gifted soldier, the appreciation of infantry and the ability to use it effectively is always evident. The infantryman may be on foot or may be transported on horseback or in a truck, tank, or airplane for mobility, but when he arrives at the point of contact he fights on foot, behind what cover is available or can be improvised.

The first of the eleven generals, Nathanael Greene, lost all his battles but won his important Southern Campaign in the American Revolution. His object was to stay in the field and to keep fighting, to wear his enemy down until he should make a move that would enable his opponent, Greene, to cancel all his losses. The author has great admiration for the impetuous Anthony Wayne, whose fame rests largely on the storming of Stony Point in the American Revolution and the battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794 which ended British occupation of American soil. Wayne's fame is made to rest largely on his ability to overcome the machinations of "the three evil geniuses"—Charles Lee, Arthur St. Clair, and James Wilkinson, especially the latter. The next selection is Jacob Brown, in the War of 1812, who is questionably characterized as "the best battle captain in the history of the nation." A citizen soldier, Brown came by his tactical skill through innate ability rather than from study and practice.

In the case of Richard M. Johnson, in the War of 1812, and John Buford, in the Civil War, the author is on more solid ground, the one an amateur, the other a professional soldier. The fame of each rests on one battle—Johnson at

the battle of the Thames in 1813 and Buford at Gettysburg in 1863. Each, fifty years apart, successfully adapted the use of cavalry, in a new way, to particular situations, each fighting his men either mounted or on the ground as seemed most effective. From Buford, the cavalryman, the author moves to his hero, Philip H. Sheridan, a synthetic cavalryman, who with General Omar Bradley is given the largest amount of space, 58 pages each. Sheridan began and ended his active field service as an infantryman; his cavalry service was brief, about eight months in all, three of them in 1862 and five in 1864. He owed his success to three things—his own versatile qualities of leadership in battle, the friendship of Grant, and superior numbers, a combination hard to beat. His fame rests on his success in the Shenandoah Valley in the summer of 1864, during which period he enjoyed a constant numerical superiority of better than two to one and a much greater advantage in materiel and equipment. The credit for much of this success must be given to his former classmate at West Point and chief subordinate, General George Crook, notwithstanding the absurd claims made in the poem, "Sheridan's Ride," which did much to perpetuate Sheridan's fame.

Of General George H. Thomas, the "Rock of Chickamauga," much has been written. Thomas's great strength was his ability to stand firm under great pressure, physical, moral, or psychological. He was solid but not spectacular, reliable, and taciturn. His most effective performance was his organization of an army from nondescript troops to oppose Hood's advance into Tennessee in the fall of 1864 and his tactical direction of the battle of Nashville in December, 1864, the only major engagement in the Civil War in which a Confederate army was driven in confusion from the field of battle.

After nearly three years as a staff officer and about six months as a cavalry commander, General James Harrison Wilson was sent to Thomas at Nashville to organize and direct his cavalry. This he did, expeditiously and successfully. Though superior in numbers to Forrest, commanding Hood's cavalry, Wilson could hardly be called successful in his opposition. In addition, Forrest's effort was dispersed; Wilson's, in the early weeks of the movement back to Nashville, was confined to protecting Thomas's withdrawal and concentration. But in the battle of Nashville, his use of his cavalry, fighting dismounted, broke Hood's left flank and created a situation in which Thomas with superb tactical skill accomplished the defeat of Hood's decimated army. Wilson closed his Civil War career with a campaign into the heart of the tottering Confederacy which ended with the defeat of Forrest at Selma, Alabama, a victory largely due to Wilson's intelligent use of weapons and new tactical methods and to superior numbers and equipment. Wilson, with more originality and effectiveness than either Sheridan or Buford, was the precursor of present-day motorized infantry.

The last three generals—Summerall, Vandegrift, and Bradley—bring us to the modern era of warfare. But here, too, though the weapons have changed and numbers have vastly increased, the principles are still much the same, and



the man on the ground with a gun in his hand is still the arbiter of victory. Summerall was the exponent of a war of movement brought into being after several years of trench warfare. Vandegrift, leading American troops for the first time in modern war in the wastes of the Pacific Ocean at Guadalcanal, created an effective pattern of defense and attack new to American military history. General Omar Bradley, another professional soldier, one of the greatest of military tacticians, solved new problems of co-ordination on sea, on land, and in the air and of troop movements on the ground. No American military commander has personally directed the movements of so many men over so large and varied a terrain and against such a well-led and well-equipped opponent as did Bradley in the final year of World War II.

This book, though in many respects uncritical, is well and interestingly written and is devoted almost exclusively to tactical leadership. The various chapters have individually appeared in several service and other publications, and each chapter is a unit in itself. Each chapter includes line cut maps in the text which are very helpful to the reader. There are no illustrations, bibliography, or footnotes, and there is no index.

Locust Valley, N. Y.

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

*Lots of Land.* By Curtis Bishop. (Austin: The Steck Company, 1949. Pp. x, 307. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.00.)

This is a friendly account of that part of the world the Indians called "the friendly land," Texas. The author, a Texas newspaperman-novelist, sets out to humanize—and even dramatize—the history of the public domain of Texas. His attention is dedicated to both the land and the people upon it, for this is the story of both the hundreds of millions of acres and the tens of millions of people who across the years have answered to the name Texan. The end product of his effort falls midway between the levity looked for by a light-reading public and the seriousness hoped for by the historical profession. Needless to say, the usual norms of historical criticism are not to be applied in full vigor to this work.

For valid reasons the author presents his work topically rather than with slavish adherence to chronology. The first two sections, "The Explorer" and "The Settler," embrace approximately one-third of the volume. They concern the period prior to Texan independence, and though the treatment of the Spanish era (1530's-1821) is thinly written, that of the Mexican period (1821-1836) is the most richly recorded portion of the entire study.

Within the remaining sections, "The Settler," "The Foreigner," "The Cowboy," "The Speculator," and "The Oilman," the treatment is exceedingly kaleidoscopic. An air of almost racy abandon is created by the inclusion of numerous stories: the Kentuckian Baylie talking back to Stephen Austin, Black Peter carrying off the victims of cholera, General Rusk bracing himself for

battle in the nearest saloon, and Judge Bean saving himself a second trip by extending his inquest to the quick as well as the dead. Nor does the author overlook the various "battles" the land inspired: the battle of the archives in 1842, the Cart War of 1857, the barbed-wire and free-grass fracas of the 1880's, and the land-rush battles that ushered in the present century.

*Lots of Land* can be pleasant yet instructive reading for the sophisticated urbanite of the twentieth century who may tend to lose sight of the significance of the land in the story of our nation. To those still closely associated with the land this lively account will have added meaning.

Because of special circumstances related to the writing of the volume, it is insufficient to say the author achieves his purpose with a certain literary dash that finds the product of his pen a contribution to "Texas literature." Mr. Bascom Giles, commissioner of the General Land Office, worked with Mr. Bishop, putting at the latter's disposal not only the rich storehouse of knowledge that is his by virtue of thirty years' firsthand acquaintance with the public domain of Texas but also important historical materials. For that reason the question is in order, Is *Lots of Land* a contribution to historical literature?

Given the open sesame that was Commissioner Giles' co-operation, the author's work is disappointing to the historian. True the heavy dependence upon such sound scholarship as that represented by Barker and Webb is recurrently evident. Not so apparent is the contribution directly from the archives of the General Land Office. Aside from occasional statistics the reader is led to conclude the author's contribution to previous knowledge is very slight.

One wonders about the relationship of the bibliography to the text. On the one hand fewer than 25 per cent of the titles listed are ever cited; on the other hand dozens of works which are mentioned are not included in the bibliography. The serviceability of the volume for reference purposes is definitely restricted by the absence of an index. Furthermore even the most boastful of Texans does not know his state so well that at least one map would not enrich his understanding of his pride and joy.

Nevertheless the professional historian may well welcome *Lots of Land* because of the clarity with which it points to periods and problems deserving of further serious research. Among other things the sketchiness of the accounts of the foreign groups that were attracted to Texas and of the foreign capitalists in the cattle country should lure the professional, be he historian, sociologist, or economist.

Washington University

CLINTON HARVEY GARDINER

*The Voice of the Coyote.* By J. Frank Dobie. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1949. Pp. xx, 386. Illustrations, notes. \$4.00.)

The small, wise, and tuneful wolf of the prairies, the coyote, is one of the most appealing folk symbols of the West. He is such an integral part of the life

of that great area, the outer confines of which for the coyote are Alaska and Costa Rica, that his likeness is to be found in the ancient monuments of Mexico and his characteristics are recorded in thousands of books of science, travel, sport, and reminiscences. According to Professor Dobie descriptions in English date from 1805 when an entry in the Lewis and Clark journals referred to the coyote as "a small wolf or burrowing-dog . . . found in almost all the open plains . . . of an intermediate size between the fox and dog, very delicately formed, fleet and active."

A careful study of this vast literature and the observations of a lifetime have enabled Dobie to write *The Voice of the Coyote*. His publishers describe it as a "new kind of natural history." It is a study in natural history, the story of the coyote's existence in human imagination, and the interpretation of Dobie's high respect and affection for an animal who began talking to him over the rock walls of his boyhood ranch home in Texas. In 1921, the author says, he began "setting down some things I heard about Señor Coyote and making notes on his record in print." In 1937 he supervised what he regarded as an outstanding master's thesis on the coyote in American literature; and in 1949 he produced this exhaustive work.

To Indians the coyote's voice (according to its loudness, frequency, and modifications of yelpings) has been a warning of the approach of friend or foe. In Willa Cather's *My Antonia* the coyote's whining howl prophesied the coming of winter. His is a song that may be heard five miles away and because of its singular quality the author vows he would like to "go to bed every night with coyote voices in my ears and with them greet the gray light of every dawn."

This sentiment is not shared by many ranchers who regard the coyotes as the archpredators upon sheep. Coyotes are also charged with the killing of goats, chickens, turkeys, occasionally a small calf, deer, and other game animals as well as game birds. From 1915, when the Federal government began systematic destruction of predatory animals, to 1947 a total of nearly two million coyotes were destroyed: about one-third of a million in Texas and other large numbers in Idaho, Wyoming, Oregon, Utah, Nevada, California, and Colorado. The Brush Country of southern Texas contains the main concentration of these animals left on the continent.

Defenders of the coyote maintain that his benevolences lie in keeping down rabbits, rats, prairie dogs, ground squirrels and other rodents, and that he is valuable as a fur-bearer. But Dobie's defense is largely based on the contention that the coyote is an extraordinary character and that he "has something in common with Abraham Lincoln, Robin Hood, Joan of Arc, Br'er Rabbit and other personalities—something that sets popular imagination to creating." A large part of the volume is given over to recounting stories to indicate the importance of the coyote as a folk symbol in the West. The last four of these tales form the final chapter under the unique heading, "Tales of Don Coyote."

With sympathetic understanding of and strong feeling for the coyote Dobie

has written what appears to be the last word on the nature of this animal and the entrenched position he occupies in American folklore. Moreover, his writing possesses a charm of sufficient strength to hold his reader to the last word.

Rollins College

A. J. HANNA

*Exploring the South.* By Rupert B. Vance, John E. Ivey, Jr., and Marjorie N. Bond. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. x, 404. Maps, illustrations, references. \$3.50.)

The southern region has been studied for years by specialized social scientists and social critics, but *Exploring the South* is a new achievement. It is a co-operative and constructive interpretation of the area's resources and potentialities, both physical and human. Moreover, it is written, and well written, for young Southerners. It puts the present South in its general historical setting, and geographically it shows the place of the South in the American nation. It has twenty-three chapters with such titles as "The People," "The Land," "Agricultural Pattern," "Cotton," "Livestock," "Forests," "Rocks and Minerals," "The Machine Age," "Textiles," and "The Road Ahead." It gives "References for Aids to Learning," including a listing of educational films and film agencies. Finally, it provides "Selected References for the Teacher." The text is eloquently illustrated by a wide range of maps, charts, and sketches by Carolyn Bolt and Don White. Its fulfillment of purpose in graphic appeal to school pupils and teachers should detract not at all from its interest to all who would know the South.

These southern authors sound a note of hope and optimism for their region, but they are also careful to present the facts realistically, with abundant emphasis on the need for the conservation of resources. They point to the damage that has resulted from the wasteful exploitation of soil and timber in the land that is Dixie. They show, for instance, how much soil cornfields lose per acre when it rains and how little, in contrast, is lost by grass fields. They point the way toward a new agriculture and a new forest policy. They discuss community development and methods for putting ideas to work. In approaching the human element, they emphasize "teamwork" as the "key to the future."

*Exploring the South* is more than a book by three authors. In complicated technical terms, it was prepared by the Division of Research Interpretation of the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina. It was prepared for the Committee on Southern Regional Studies and Education of the American Council on Education. It was developed with the aid of an advisory committee with members from thirteen southern states, including the border states of Kentucky and Oklahoma. Financial support from the General Education Board made the work possible.

This thorough but simple study is a part and a symbol of a co-operative movement in the South, a movement for channeling the results of research in

education. It represents a wholesome philosophy teaching by example, and it is attractively printed.

Vanderbilt University

H. C. NIXON

*TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization.*  
By Philip Selznick. *University of California Publications in Culture and Society*, Volume III. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949. Pp. x, 274. Bibliography. \$3.75.)

In a recent address entitled "The American Way" James P. Pope, a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, said that what the Authority and the people of the Tennessee Valley are doing "is as American as Walt Whitman." Although this statement had a direct reference to the creation and realization of economic opportunity, it inferred at least a grass-roots policy in action. This policy, which has helped produce a noticeable *esprit de corps* in the area, was initiated as no casual feature of TVA's philosophy. It is a part of a genuine concern for democratic methods. In addition, by the use of a mass base the Authority believed it could better integrate itself in the valley, exercise more effectively its managerial autonomy, and reduce the obnoxious associations which its imposed authority was said to possess.

Mr. Selznick's interest is not in an historical approach to the application of the grass-roots thesis; rather, as he states in the preface, he hopes that he has made a contribution "toward the evolution of a theory of organization." The key to his specialized study is to be found in the subtitle, "A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization." Thus his attention is not given to power, dams, or fertilizer, but to the Authority's status "as a social instrument" or a "living institution." The basic research for the study was done in 1942-1943 when the author held a fellowship granted by the Social Science Research Council. Belated publication, caused by wartime delays, means that examples are not drawn from current illustrations or policy but from the period of the first decade of the TVA alone.

TVA as a Federal regional agency operating outside the departmental ranks of government represents an innovation in organization. Set up by region rather than by function it was a challenge to policy making and to administrative organization. In Part I of his book, Mr. Selznick analyzes and paraphrases the official doctrine developed in TVA. The grass-roots principle was a vital part of this doctrine. In addition to the already stated reasons for its importance the author observes that "to some extent, fondness for the grass-roots theory resulted because it was raised as a banner in the internal conflict which rocked the agency not long after its inception." The theory itself was not without ambiguities which made it difficult to translate into action while, in addition, the author illustrates how it brought TVA into early conflict with branches of the Federal government, especially the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, that had programs which reached into the Tennessee River watershed.

Part II, "The Informal Coöptation of Grass-Roots Elements—An Administrative Constituency and Its Consequences," discusses the application of the grass-roots principle in the agricultural program of TVA, which is its chief area of usage. Coöptation is defined as "the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence." The agriculturalists working through local institutions were led by Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, who is recognized as the originator of the grass-roots theory in TVA. His earlier associations undoubtedly influenced the selection of the land-grant college extension service as the local institution through which to work. In it TVA had a stable going concern with deep associations in the area. Through it friendships were extended. But Mr. Selznick points out that this service had certain weaknesses which were thus made TVA weaknesses and that conflict with rival groups such as the Farm Security Administration and the Soil Conservation Service was soon provoked. Thus this phase of the grass-roots program forced TVA into embarrassing controversy, made the Authority pull chestnuts out of the fire, ultimately caused a reversal in policy regarding the ownership of protective strips for reservoirs, and made TVA bear the weight of numerous pressures.

In the last section, "Formal Coöptation of Grass-Roots Elements—Ambiguities of Participation," attention is given to another phase of the grass-roots idea. This deals with citizen participation through voluntary associations (formal coöptation). Such associations were developed as agents for the distribution of power and fertilizers. They are shown as relatively weak adjuncts in administration and displayed but limited leadership although again the "local flavor" was an asset.

TVA is represented as a sincere experiment with many meritorious features attempting to give weight and content to democracy through planning. Since many of the Authority's policies are above reproach, Mr. Selznick feels that the ambiguities and weaknesses of the grass-roots doctrine are of fundamental importance as he concludes that "something more than virtue is necessary in the realm of circumstances and power." Possibly his judgments are, however, somewhat premature, for the problems for TVA in perfecting a grass-roots policy were numerous. Certainly the people of the area were a diverse lot, isolation and provincialism had narrowed their view through the years, poverty had frequently dulled the edge of native ability, and, in parts, human erosion was as noticeable as soil erosion. Only time and the ameliorating effect of a stimulating environment can prove the place of these citizens as grass-roots participants.

Mr. Selznick's study of grass roots is hardly for any of these grass rooters. Sociological terminology which intrudes into all his analyses is ponderous and wordy. As one plods through it, it becomes barrenly abstract and loses association with the historical data presented as a base for the theory. However, this

study does reveal the tremendous wealth of material for study that is found in TVA, which in an exemplary fashion has its lachstrings out for the researcher.

University of Chattanooga

JAMES W. LIVINGOOD

*Forsyth: A County on the March.* By Adelaide L. Fries and others. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. vii, 248. Illustrations. \$3.50.)

The centennial of Forsyth County, North Carolina, recently celebrated in Winston-Salem, is the immediate occasion for this volume. But the story of its people begins nearly one hundred years before Forsyth County was created. It was in 1753 that Moravian settlers first came into Piedmont Carolina and, in the next decade, founded the town of Salem. Almost a century later was founded near by the town of Winston and a new county was created by the legislature. In 1913, by vote of the people, the two towns became one and, as Winston-Salem, developed into the great industrial center of the southern Piedmont.

Miss Fries and her associates have skillfully told the story of a varied and important growth. They have set forth beautifully the story of old Salem and the development of the Moravian culture which still pervades much of the region. The smaller towns and hamlets of the county are not neglected, and from the abundant original records they have revealed the spirit and achievements of their people in agriculture, education, medicine, transportation, banking, social welfare, and many other fields of human endeavor. But most significant of all have been the accomplishments in manufacture which have given to its principal city the well-earned title "City of Industry."

The most notable feature of this significant story is that it consists not only of an impressive array of facts and figures regarding the principal industries, but it is an interpretation as well as a history—an explanation of the early development of a strong industrial economy in a prevailing agrarian region.

The pioneers of Salem, through necessity, cultivated an inventive and productive economy that developed from small-scale manufacturing into large-scale modern plants. Since the most readily available raw materials of the Carolinas were tobacco, cotton, and lumber, it was natural that the largest industries should center around their manufacture. It was an example of local ingenuity utilizing available resources and building an industrial life by deliberation rather than by chance. The past century has brought a steady and remarkable growth, especially in tobacco, textiles, and woodwork. While many cities can claim that they are important manufacturing centers, few can claim world primacy in the manufacture of one or more products. But Winston-Salem claims it in three. It is the world's largest tobacco manufacturing center, the home of the largest manufactory of knit underwear, and the home of the largest circular knit hosiery mill in the world. These three world leaders, and most of the other enterprises of the city, had their beginning in the county, were conceived by

industrial-minded local citizens, and were developed by local ingenuity. Such industries have helped to make Winston-Salem the leading industrial city of the Carolinas and the third city of the South in the value of its manufactured products.

This volume achieves a fine blend of the particular and the general in the history of a region. It tells of local families of prominence, as county histories are supposed to do, but it does more. The training and vision of the authors, together with the broad scope of the subject before them, has made possible a local history of more than usual importance because it has been placed in the larger context of southern industrial development, of which its story is a highly significant part. The result is a distinguished history of interest and meaning concerning the past, present, and future of Forsyth County.

Davidson College

FRONTIS W. JOHNSTON

*Regional Research Cooperation: A Statement of Regional Research Procedures as developed by The Regional Land Tenure Research Project.* By Harold Hoffsommer. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. ix, 136. Frontispiece, appendices. \$2.50.)

This small volume is a sort of case-study account of the experience of the Regional Land Tenure Research Project during its four years of operation (1942-1946), written by its one and only director. The project, financed by the General Education Board, the Farm Foundation, and the United States Department of Agriculture to the extent of \$375,000, was aimed primarily at the study of the social and economic aspects of land tenure in the five-state "region" of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas. It also had as a leading objective the development "of a plan for research cooperation." The statement of this plan receives exclusive and detailed consideration in the work under review. A footnote, however, announces that a major regional subject-matter report of sizable proportions is being published by the University of North Carolina Press. Such a book will provide some basis for evaluating the impact of this regional undertaking upon our knowledge of land tenure.

The Regional Land Tenure Project represented an attempt to bring together in a co-operative (not merely a co-ordinated) research effort the departments of agricultural economics and rural sociology of the five land-grant colleges of the area under study, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. It tried to achieve an advance from discussion to action in the long-talked-about area of regional research. The particular procedure followed in this endeavor is catalogued in detail, with a chapter devoted to each of the following topics: objectives, project working plan, collecting the data, processing the data, writing the reports, and administrative arrangements. In a final chapter the author sets down his "broad impressions growing out of the Regional Research Project experience."

Summarizing his own aspirations for this work, Dr. Hoffsommer states, "It



is hoped that this account may constitute a partial guide to those undertaking regional research or, failing that, that it may at least serve to point out some of the crucial problems which are likely to be encountered in such research." The frank and candid discussion of the many perplexing difficulties met—for which the writer is to be commended—adds greatly to its value along these lines. As a result of this careful documentation, some pitfalls can certainly be avoided in similar undertakings in the future. The careful reader, however, cannot but be impressed by the almost insuperable nature of the task confronting regional projects organized on such a basis. Scholars who are steeped in a tradition of independent and competitive research effort and are employed by different agencies, each of which, for obvious reasons, views the state in which it is situated as its sole area of interest, are not easily molded into a genuinely co-operative regional research team.

Louisiana State University

HOMER L. HITT

*Archibald Henderson: The New Crichton. A Composite Portrait: Authorized.*

Edited by Samuel Stevens Hood. (New York: The Beechurst Press, 1949.

Pp. xviii, 252. Illustrations, bibliography. \$5.00.)

All hail the King! the uncrowned king of Chapel Hill—Archibald Henderson—a man aptly described as "master of all trades and jack of none," is the refrain of this excellently printed volume of thirty-odd essays. It is an authorized "literary mosaic" written by personages ranging from the mayor of Chapel Hill, Robert W. Madry, to the late Charles A. Beard. Some of the essays, like "Creative Biographer" by Stark Young, are mere one-paragraph endorsements, while others, like "Mathematician and Man" by a colleague in the mathematics department, T. F. Hickerson, run to upwards of twenty pages. Some, like "Better Than Boswell" by Percy MacKaye, are composed largely of excerpts taken from things written at other times for other occasions; while others, like "A Mathematician in History" by R. S. Cotterill, in which he points out that the phenomenon occurred because the mathematician's name was Henderson, were written for the present volume.

The subtitle, *The New Crichton*, suggests the many-sided man of the Renaissance. The contents bear out the implication. Beginning with Gerald W. Johnson's "A Cosmopolitan Villager," wherein he investigates how Dr. Henderson escaped what the lawyer in Sinclair Lewis' *Main Street* called "the village virus," it closes with a thirty-one-page bibliography of his writings. And the editor's division of the essays into the four groups of literature, history, mathematics, and biography, instead of departmentalizing "the new Crichton," has actually served to highlight his versatility.

The portrait presented of Dr. Henderson is pleasing. It is a portrait of an energetic college athlete who played out his eligibility on the scrubs; of a challenging classroom teacher who motivated students by his enthusiasm; of an

umbrella-carrying pedestrian who does not own an automobile; and of a friendly villager who has learned "to walk with kings, yet keep the common touch." Yet it has its blemishes. The editor warns that "at close range a portrait in literary mosaic reveals its crude construction," and his warning is validated by the almost continuous foreground position of George Bernard Shaw; by the repeated comparisons of Dr. Henderson to Boswell; and by the rather monotonous repetition of the query: "How could the same man write *The Twenty-Seven Lines on the Cubic Surface*, *The Conquest of the Old Southwest*, and *George Bernard Shaw: Playboy and Prophet*?"

In his essay "Archibald Henderson—Anarch," Richard Barry tells that while he was discussing his biography of John Rutledge with Dr. Henderson, the great man placed his fingers and thumbs together in a circle and said, "Let us imagine that we have here a magic ring inside of which we hold the heroes of the Revolution. . . . This ring has existed for more than 150 years. . . . Young man, what you are asking us to do . . . is to open this magic ring to permit the entrance of a new figure." It seems appropriate that this story should be included in a volume which represents the marshaling of thirty-odd authorities showing that the magic ring around the heroes of the Renaissance should be opened to allow the many-sided Archibald Henderson to enter and stand alongside such many-sided men of the Renaissance as "The Admirable" Crichton and Leonardo da Vinci.

Howard College

WILLIAM PRATT DALE, II

*Paraguay: An Informal History.* By Harris Gaylord Warren. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949. Pp. xii, 393. Illustrations, maps, appendix, bibliographical essay. \$5.00.)

Not since the appearance about a generation ago of W. H. Koebel's *Paraguay* has there been any treatment in English of the general history of this lesser-known South American nation. Whether formal or informal, some study of the broader aspects of Paraguayan history has been long overdue.

Professor Warren, as the subtitle of his book suggests, makes no pretense at writing a definitive history of the land made famous by the Jesuit missions. He has written a book that is quite readable and one that will serve its purpose well. In producing this synthesis, the author has made extensive use of secondary materials in Spanish, in English, in French, and in German. He made little or no use of monographic material, of newspapers, or of other primary material that may have been available to him while he served in the American legation in Asunción.

To compress four hundred years of the history of even Paraguay into a moderately sized volume is a difficult task, but Professor Warren has accomplished his task well. He introduces his subject with brief descriptions of the flora and fauna of Paraguay, with some of the myths that treat of the early history of the

land, and with an account of the Indians who lived there when the Spaniards came. From that point on there is a simple narration of events, from the appearance of the white man to the presidential election of 1948. No major phase of Paraguayan history is omitted; each period is presented adequately in relationship to the entire history of the country. Of special interest are the chapters on the famous dictators and on Paraguay's two great wars, whereas one of the best features of the book, especially for the student of South American history, is the bibliographical essay.

The author's style is light, which makes for easy reading. Sometimes, however, the manner of presentation becomes almost too light, a manner which appears, to the reviewer at least, to detract a little from even an informal history. In the last few chapters, the reviewer believes that some references to the exact sources of information would bolster considerably the material presented. The dawn of a "New Paraguay" in 1936 and the part which Paraguay played in the recent war are subject to some differences of opinion, and a proper historical evaluation is difficult.

In spite of these minor objections and in view of the objectives of the author, *Paraguay: An Informal History* will be of great assistance to both the student of Latin-American history and to the so-called general reader, a person frequently overlooked by the historian.

Birmingham-Southern College

LEON F. SENSABAUGH

*Race and Region: A Descriptive Bibliography Compiled with Special Reference to the Relations Between Whites and Negroes in the United States.* By Edgar T. Thompson and Alma Macy Thompson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949. Pp. xiv, 194. \$5.00.)

North Carolina is a progressive state. So says everyone from Arnold Toynbee the cosmologist to Josephus Daniels the local booster. In 1900 it had a statesman named Walter Hines Page who, in proving that in certain practical matters North Carolina was inferior to Iowa, pointed out the means by which the area of Confederate heroes two hundred miles below the Potomac might catch up with the famous hog's paradise beyond the Mississippi. North Carolina in 1949 has a United States senator who has signed enough uplifting resolutions to put his state out of the benighted South onto the borders of Utopia. Of course sticklers may point out that these assertions are not entirely true: that Toynbee was wrong in saying that Woodrow Wilson was born in North Carolina; that Josephus Daniels was as southern as Cole Blease; that Frank Graham is still a southern Democrat; that Raleigh has not abandoned its color line or its Negro slums; that Tom Wolfe and Norman Foerster prove that Chapel Hill is charmingly provincial; and that in many forms of bigness North Carolina is 'way behind Texas.

Such cynicism, however, fades when one inspects *Race and Region*. It is a

book designed to cut the heart out of those elements of southern bigotry which may survive in North Carolina by throwing light on the issue which has given the region below the Potomac its unprogressive slant. Here is a bibliography designed to guide the North Carolina public to the fact of white-Negro relations. Despite the modest disclaimer of its compilers, the book is comprehensive, perhaps too comprehensive for its pedagogical purpose. It contains everything on race from *Uncle Remus* to Erich Voegelin's *Die Rassenidee in der Geistesgeschichte von Ray bis Carus*. It is fantastic that William Byrd's lubberlanders should have, in a mere two hundred years, traveled through the Land of Eden and from the heights at Gettysburg to a point where they are willing to be critical of their darkest spot. The compilers of the book inform us that the North Carolina Division of Cooperation in Education and Race Relations has taught both Negroes and whites to say "we" and to see each other in a different light. After each title in the book are placed the symbols *NcD*, *NcU*, and *NcC* telling prospective investigators where to go for this light.

Aside from the uses of this work for the general public, it will be valuable for specialists in southern history and social conditions. No bibliography on the Negro of comparable scope has been published since Monroe Work's compilation of 1928. Its senior editor, Mr. Thompson, lives up to his reputation for insight into southern problems previously established by his brilliant essay, "The Natural History of Agricultural Labor in the South." As a sociologist he is much broader in his interests than most southern historians deign to be, treating the problems of anthropology, religion, literature, psychology, and art as well as those of politics, education, and economics. Through references here given, one can discover the eating habits of Southerners, their actual conduct in the classroom, the behavior of Negro preachers, the story of Negro births and deaths, the history of Negro speech and songs, and even the lives of those obscure Southerners who are adjudged neither white nor black.

Louisiana State University

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

## Historical News and Notices

### THE ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association for 1949 will be held in Williamsburg, Virginia, November 10-12. The Committee on Program, of which C. Vann Woodward, Johns Hopkins University, is chairman, has planned eleven sessions. One of these has been designed especially for historians of Latin America and United States foreign policy, and one for modern European historians. Most of the other sessions relate to the field of southern history, but several are of general interest.

The program will open at 10:00 A. M. Thursday. Wesley Frank Craven, New York University, will preside at a session on colonial institutions. Two papers will be read, one on "Origins of the Southern Labor System," by Oscar Handlin, Harvard University, and the other on "The Virginia Vestry: A Study in Political Responsibility," by James K. Owen, Louisiana State University. At the other Thursday morning session, historical literature on the Negro will be re-examined, with Chase C. Mooney, Indiana University, reappraising the historians "Of the Negro as Slave" and Vernon L. Wharton, Millsaps College, "Of the Negro as Freedman." Frank L. Owsley, University of Alabama, will preside.

"The South at Arms" will be the theme of one session Thursday afternoon, with Henry S. Commager, Columbia University, presiding. John Hope Franklin, Howard University, will discuss "The Martial Spirit of the Old South," and Bell I. Wiley, Emory University, will present "Southern Reaction to Northern Invasion." A session planned for Latin American and United States diplomatic historians will meet at the same time. Alan K. Manchester, Duke University, will read a paper on "The Recognition of Brazilian Independence," and Clinton H. Gardiner, Washington University, will discuss "Mexican Reorientation toward the Pacific World in the Nineteenth Century." William J. Griffith, Tulane University, will preside.

Following a dinner on Thursday evening, David M. Potter, Yale University, and H. Clarence Nixon, Vanderbilt University, will appraise the first fifteen years of the Southern Historical Association, with Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky, presiding. Professor Potter's paper will be "*Journal of Southern History: First Fifteen Volumes*," and Professor Nixon will discuss "Paths to the Past: The Presidential Addresses."

Historical approaches to the Civil War are to be considered on Friday morning, with Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania, presenting "1461-1861: The American Civil War in Its True Perspective" and Avery O. Craven, Uni-

versity of Chicago, reading "The 1840's and the Civil War." J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, University of North Carolina, will preside. Concurrently a panel of three historians will evaluate William L. Langer's *Rise of Modern Europe* series. J. Wesley Hoffman, University of Tennessee, will appraise "The Eighteenth Century Volumes," James L. Godfrey, University of North Carolina, "The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Period Volumes," and George A. Carbone, University of Mississippi, "The Nineteenth Century Volumes." Presiding will be Oron J. Hale, University of Virginia.

The annual business meeting and election of officers will be held on Friday following a luncheon. No sessions have been planned for that afternoon. The annual dinner has been scheduled for Friday evening, at which time Lester J. Cappon, Institute of Early American History and Culture, will deliver the presidential address.

There will be two final sessions on Saturday morning. One of these, to be presided over by Douglass Adair, College of William and Mary, will feature a treatment of "Nationalism in Revolutionary Virginia: A Reappraisal," by Irving Brant, Washington, D. C. Bernard Mayo, University of Virginia, will discuss Mr. Brant's paper. The other Saturday morning program, "Recapturing the Lost Reader: Publishers and Historians," will be presided over by Dumas Malone, Columbia University. Alfred A. Knopf will discuss the subject "From the New York Angle," and Lambert Davis, University of North Carolina Press, "From the University Press Angle."

With the exception of the dinner sessions, the Committee on Program anticipates that there will be discussion of all papers from the floor.

#### PERSONAL

James W. Silver, University of Mississippi, has received a Fulbright appointment to teach in the University of Edinburgh during 1949-1950.

A Fulbright grant to do research in the University of London has been awarded to Malcolm Lester, Mercer University, who has been on leave during the past year to study in the University of Virginia as a General Education Board fellow.

Sidney Warren, University of Florida, has accepted the visiting professorship of American history in the University of Durham, England, for 1949-1950, where he will lecture on American institutions and thought.

Harold T. Parker, Duke University, has been granted leave of absence for the coming year to do research in the French archives.

James Harvey Young, Emory University, will be on leave of absence for the

year 1949-1950 to be visiting associate professor of history in the general education program in Columbia University.

Ross H. McLean, Emory University, received a grant from the Carnegie fund of the University Center in Georgia to permit him to spend the summer in research on phases of seventeenth-century English biography. Francis S. Benjamin, also of Emory, will spend the fall quarter in France and Italy continuing his research in medieval astronomy, facilitated by a Carnegie grant.

Sidney Walter Martin, professor of history in the University of Georgia, has been appointed dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The Louisiana State Board of Education in May elected Garnie W. McGinty, professor of history and head of the department of social sciences in Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, acting president of Northwestern State College, effective July 1.

T. Conn Bryan has been promoted to head of the department of social sciences in North Georgia College.

The following promotions in departments of history in southern institutions have been announced: Alexander Marchant, Vanderbilt University, to professor; Gilbert C. Fite, University of Oklahoma, Roderic H. Davison, George Washington University, Porter Lee Fortune, Mississippi Southern College, Carl B. Cone and J. Merton England, University of Kentucky, to associate professor; John Chalmers Vinson, University of Georgia, and Rhea A. Taylor, University of Kentucky, to assistant professor.

New appointments in history departments include the following: Robert A. Lively, instructor, Princeton University; Jean Kennedy Todd, instructor, Winthrop College; Philip Thayer, instructor, Randolph-Macon Woman's College; Richard C. Haskett, formerly of Princeton University, assistant professor, George Washington University; John Duffy, formerly of Southeastern Louisiana College, associate professor, and George Stokes, assistant professor, Northwestern Louisiana State College; C. Jay Smith and Wilbur D. Jones, instructors, University of Georgia; William P. Roberts, Jr., assistant professor, North Georgia College; Roscoe L. Strickland, assistant professor, East Tennessee State Teachers College; J. Russell Major, instructor, Emory University; James T. Robison, associate professor, and Aaron M. Boom, Lee N. Newcomer, and Mary Frances Gyles, assistant professors, Memphis State College.

J. Harold Easterby has been granted a year's leave of absence by the College of Charleston to serve as secretary to the Historical Commission of South

Carolina. He succeeds A. S. Salley, who was retired on June 24 after forty-four years of service.

Evelyn Wiley, Birmingham-Southern College, is spending the summer, fall, and winter in Washington, D. C., working on Adult Education of UNESCO. She will also represent the college in the Washington Semester Plan in American University, teaching two night school courses.

Members of history staffs in a number of southern schools are planning to resume graduate work during the coming academic year. George Shackelford, assistant professor in Birmingham-Southern College, has resigned to continue his graduate study in Columbia University. William B. Boyd, Emory University, has resigned his instructorship to do graduate work in the University of Pennsylvania. Francis V. McMillen, Mississippi State College, will be on leave during the fall semester to complete work on his doctorate at the University of Texas. J. E. Tuttle, Clemson College, has been given leave to study in the University of South Carolina, and Sarah Lemmon of Meredith College, C. H. Carpenter of Clemson, and Lewis P. Jones of Wofford College have all received leaves for graduate study at the University of North Carolina. Mr. Jones' place will be filled by Harry Lewis Harvin, Jr., and Fannie Memory Farmer has joined the history department in Meredith College.

During the summer, Glover Moore, who has been promoted to acting professor of history in Mississippi State College, did research in libraries in Philadelphia, New York, and Portland, Maine, preparatory to the completion of his study on the Missouri Controversy. James H. Grisham, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, was on leave to continue work on his doctorate in the University of Texas, and Richard H. Bjurberg, of the same institution, did research in Washington, D. C.

Stuart R. Tompkins, University of Oklahoma, had leave of absence during the second semester and the summer of 1949 under a Rockefeller grant to do research on the Russian intelligentsia. Edward Everett Dale, also of Oklahoma, spent the summer on a lecture tour to Wisconsin, North Dakota, Washington, California, and Colorado.

Robert H. Spiro, King College, has been on leave during the past year for study at the University of Edinburgh.

Thomas B. Alexander has resigned as associate professor of history and government in Clemson College to accept a position as professor of history and chairman of the division of social sciences in Georgia Teachers College, effective in September, 1949.



John Edmund Gonzales, who has been on leave of absence for the past year studying in the University of North Carolina, will return to Mississippi Southern College in September. William Rodemann of the same department has been granted a second year of leave to study in the University of Chicago.

Richard M. Leighton of the historical section of the Army Special Staff and formerly of the University of Cincinnati will offer a part of the work formerly given by Lowell Ragatz in George Washington University. Professor Ragatz has resigned to accept the chairmanship of the history department in Ohio State University.

William C. Binkley, Vanderbilt University, has received a grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council for a study of the Texas Revolution of 1835-1836. He is spending the summer in research in Austin, Texas. Robert S. Cotterill, Florida State University, has been given a similar grant for a study of southern Indians, 1775-1825.

Walter Johnson has returned to his permanent post in the history faculty in the University of Chicago following a year's work in the Manuscript Division of the University of Virginia Library, where he collaborated with Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., in the preparation of a volume on the Yalta Conference, which will be published in the autumn.

On June 3, Frontis W. Johnston of Davidson College lectured before the National Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D. C., on "The Constitution and the Bill of Rights."

Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina, lectured twice in the Georgia State College for Women on May 2.

During the spring of 1949 the social science departments of Mississippi State College organized a round table meeting for a dinner session monthly. The visiting lecturer at the April meeting was Francis B. Simkins, professor of history in Louisiana State University.

The Air Historical Group will move to the Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, in September. The move will not affect the group's control over all historical activities in the United States Air Force or its primary mission of preparing histories and studies relating to the Air Force. Work has begun on a two-volume history of the army air arm, 1909-1941, in addition to the seven-volume history of the AAF in World War II.

The history department of the University of Rochester is conducting an in-

teresting experiment in its doctoral training program. The scheme is based upon the department's convictions that a spirit of intimacy should exist between graduate students and teachers and that students should have full opportunity to develop effectiveness in the classroom. Only five new students are accepted each year, and they are awarded substantial fellowships in order that they may give their full time to the program. Each student is given carefully supervised teaching experience, first in section meetings, and then on the lecture platform during the second year. Although the department continues to stress exact scholarship and ability to master detail, the student is also encouraged in the art of generalization and interpretation, particularly in seminar work in the second year. Satisfactory students may have their fellowships renewed, and they are encouraged to complete their work for the doctorate within three years after receiving the A.B. degree. Inquiries about the program should be addressed to Dexter Perkins, chairman of the department.

Summer teaching appointments not previously reported include the following: Horace C. Peterson, University of Oklahoma, and Frank M. Klingberg, University of North Carolina, in Pomona College; Gerhard Masur, Sweet Briar College, and W. A. Mabry, Randolph-Macon College, in the University of Virginia; Carl G. Gustavson, Ohio University, in Emory University; Frank Freidel, Vassar College, and Robert C. L. Scott, Williams College, in George Washington University; Edward O. Guerrant, Davidson College, in the University of Southern California; Paul H. Clyde, Duke University, in Tulane University; Charles S. Sydnor, Duke University, in the University of North Carolina; Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina, in Columbia University; A. R. Newsome, University of North Carolina, in the University of Iowa; and H. E. Hirst, Elon College, in the University of Vermont.

#### HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

Mabel C. Weaks, formerly in the manuscript section of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and more recently in the manuscript department of the New York Public Library, will join the staff of the Filson Club in Louisville in September. Miss Weaks will be in charge of the Club's manuscripts and will arrange them for research use even before cataloging is completed. The Filson Club has recently obtained microfilm copies of the Draper manuscripts in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

The Georgia Historical Society held its annual meeting on February 22, 1949. J. Max Patrick of the University of Florida spoke on "The Pioneer Theater in Savannah to 1820." The officers of the Society were re-elected: president, Alexander A. Lawrence; vice-president, B. B. Cubbedge, Jr.; vice-president, R. R. Otis; secretary-treasurer, Herman W. Coolidge; and director, Mrs. Lilla M.

Hawes. On April 20, Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina lectured before the Society on "The Evolution of American Ideology: Independence (1776) and Interdependence (1945)."

The Historical Society of North Carolina held its regular spring meeting at Duke University on May 7. E. W. Knight of the University of North Carolina discussed "The Academy Movement in North Carolina"; Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina presented a paper on "Queen's College, Queen's Museum, Liberty Hall, and the Salisbury Academy"; and George W. Paschal of Wake Forest College spoke on "Baptist Academies in North Carolina."

Louis K. Koontz of the University of California, visiting professor in the University of Virginia, addressed the Albemarle County Historical Society at its summer meeting on July 20, his subject being "The Attitude of the West towards Virginia History."

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Georgia Historical Society has received the manuscript collection of the Georgia Society of Colonial Dames of America. Other recent acquisitions include *The Royal Georgia Gazette*, June 22, 1780, the only located copy of this paper; an account book of an unidentified Savannah commission merchant, 1829-1837; Chatham Hunt Club minute book, 1906-1909; Savannah Polo Club minute book, 1924-1930; and an account book of J. P. White, Savannah gunsmith, 1868-1892.

The Western Historical Manuscripts Collection of the University of Missouri has recently received a record book of steamships and their cargoes leaving the port of Cambridge, Missouri, on the Missouri River, 1859-1863; family and business letters of a pioneer Missouri circuit judge, C. S. Yancy, 1840's and 1850's; letters of a Union family, McRoberts, living in a Confederate community in Missouri during the Civil War; papers of the Columbia, Missouri, charter government committee, 1948-1949; reminiscences of a Missouri Republican, Judge Henry Lamm of Sedalia; a series of diaries written by a housewife, Rosa Schafer Sutter, living in southern Missouri, 1875-1920; the diary of Randolph Casey Paul, a Mountain Home, Arkansas, farmer, written in 1888; records, correspondence, minutes, and land plats of the Branson Town Company, 1903-1938; papers of the Corby family, pioneers in St. Joseph, Missouri; speeches of Cornelius Roach, Missouri politician, about 1916; papers of Dr. Sheppard, southern Missouri educator; and a fifteen-volume diary of J. F. Davidson, prominent citizen of Hannibal, Missouri. The materials in the Collection have been listed completely in *Bulletin* No. 5 (Columbia, Mo., mimeographed, 1949).

The Georgia State Library is preparing a new periodical, *The Commentary*, to be published three or four times a year. The first issue, now in process, will include highlights of services and activities in the library with illustrative incidents, information on books by and about Georgians, and Georgia documents listed at the library, January, 1948—April, 1949.

The Mississippi State College Library recently received the Starling Collection, the gift of the late William Starling of Greenville, Mississippi. This collection contains many valuable volumes of Americana, together with a number of rare books in Italian, French, German, Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, and Greek.

The Hispanic Institute in Florida has recently presented to Rollins College a specialized, selected collection of more than two thousand maps and pamphlets in English, Spanish, and Portuguese, on the art, literature, travel, language, and customs of Spain, Portugal, and the Latin American nations.

Recent acquisitions of the National Archives include: records, 1816-1945, of eighty consular and diplomatic posts throughout the world; records, 1879-1889, of the French canal company organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps; records, 1940-1947, chiefly microfilmed, of the Selective Service System, including instructions from state headquarters to local boards, materials relating to conscientious objectors, case files of registrants who appealed to the President, and docket books of the presidential appeal board; records of the Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section of the United States Office of Military Government for Germany, 1946-1947, consisting of questionnaires, reports, and about 1,800 photographs of war-damaged cultural institutions and monuments in the United States zone; and records of the 1949 inaugural committee. The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park has been given the personal papers of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., consisting of 864 typescript volumes of private notes and memoranda, copies of letters, transcripts of conferences, and similar materials, 1933-1945.

Recent manuscript acquisitions of Duke University include: letters of Austin Dall of Baltimore and his wife Mary A. Brand of Lexington, Kentucky, 1850's; Downing-Davis letters and papers, Granville County, North Carolina, 1790-1865; letters and papers of Dr. J. M. Gaines, Washington County, Maryland, 1850-1925; letters and papers of the Gimball family, Charleston, South Carolina, 1850's and 1860's; personal and business correspondence of the Potts and Murdock families, Frederick, Maryland, 1750-1825; letters and papers of Josiah W. Bailey, Raleigh, North Carolina, before his election to the Senate, 1900-1931; and letters, papers, and mercantile records of John Hook, Hallsford, Virginia, 1752-1889. Added to microfilm files of newspapers are the Wheeling (Virginia) *Electric Observer*, and *Working People's Advocate*, 1829-1830;

New Bern (North Carolina) *Carolina Federal Republican*, 1812-1814; and Williamsport (Maryland) *Republican Banner*, 1830-1835. Most of these items are in the George Washington Flowers Collection of Southern Americana.

The family of the late Senator John H. Overton of Louisiana has deposited in the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University his official papers, which will be made available for researchers this fall. Other acquisitions include: 957 items and 191 volumes of personal and business papers of Jean Phillip Breda, medical doctor and druggist of Natchitoches, Louisiana, and of his son, J. Ernest Breda, attorney and parish judge, 1776-1921; 41 volumes of records and 3,673 items of a law firm of Natchitoches and of Phanor Breazeale, attorney, parish superintendent of schools, newspaper editor, and Representative in Congress, 1806-1904; 63 items of land surveys and related papers, Natchitoches area, 1789-1850; 73 volumes and 313 items of Joseph Plaque, Negro farmer of Natchitoches Parish, 1901-1946; microfilm copies of 2 volumes and 6 letters of John Ransdell, planter of Rapides Parish, 1842-1869; 11 account books of John P. Snellings of Elbert County, Georgia, and later a planter in Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana, 1855-1869, 1882-1905; 27 daybooks and ledgers of John I. McCain, general merchant, Grant Parish, 1891-1932; 12 volumes of land surveys of Vicente Sebastian Pintado and Charles Leveau Trudeau, royal surveyors of Spanish colonial Louisiana and the two Floridas, and 2 related volumes, 1771-1859; additional papers of the Minor family of Mississippi and Louisiana, 1774-1914; and photographic copies of 31 items and 2 volumes of Hudson Tabor and family, reflecting principally commercial and plantation matters in southeast Louisiana but including opinions of local abolition and slave insurrectory matters (1834-1843), 1812-1916.

One of a series of books published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, *Connecticut's Years of Controversy, 1750-1776*, by Oscar Zeichner (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1949, pp. xiv, 404, end maps, illustrations, notes, bibliographical essay, \$6.00), is an account of the internal conflicts during the imperial crisis in the "land of steady habits." Bitter divisions over local issues of religion, land, taxes, trade, and politics "prepared the way for the Revolution by creating the groups that were to take the Whig and Tory sides in the last quarrels with England." Copious notes have been placed in 120 pages at the back of the book. There are numerous features that contribute to typographical excellence.

Mysteries (most of them unsolved) of North Carolina from the lost colony on Roanoke Island to the missing major of World War II, collected by John Harden for his radio program, "Tales of Tarheelia," have been published in *The Devil's Tramping Ground* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1949, pp. xiv, 178, drawings, \$3.00). Of particular historical interest,

in addition to the mystery of Roanoke Island, are the disappearance of Theodosia Burr Alston and the identity of Peter Stuart Ney.

The first century of the history of Cahokia, Illinois, the oldest permanent settlement in the Mississippi Valley, is described in John Francis McDermott and others (eds.), *Old Cahokia* (St. Louis, St. Louis Historical Documents Foundation, 1949, pp. [xvi], 355, illustrations, maps, \$3.00). The first chapter contains a narrative of the founding of Cahokia in 1698 and its growth to about 1800. The rest of the book consists of documents illustrating the history of the Holy Family Mission, social, commercial, and military life at Cahokia, and other miscellaneous letters and records. Many of these documents are reproduced here in English for the first time.

The first two volumes of *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, concern *The American Soldier*, Volume I, *Adjustment During Army Life*, and Volume II, *Combat and Its Aftermath* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1949, pp. xii, 600, vi, 676, charts, tables, appendix, \$13.50). These volumes are based on data collected by the Research Branch, War Department Information and Education Division, which was released unconditionally to the ten authors.

*The American Soldier* has been aimed by its authors toward three groups of readers: social psychologists and sociologists primarily, the armed forces, and historians. For the latter audience, the answers of more than half a million young American soldiers who were questioned during the war "is a page of the history of the war and of the history of America" (p. 4). These volumes contain studies of soldiers' attitudes toward all phases of army life, from induction to rehabilitation. As such, they have gauged as accurately as possible the collective opinion of the lower ranks of soldiers and have furnished measurements valuable for historical studies of American thought, though in some instances they seem to be only documentation of the obvious.

*The Negro Handbook, 1949* (New York, Macmillan Company, 1949, pp. x, 368, \$5.00), edited by Florence Murray, is the fourth edition of this biennial manual of current facts, statistics, and general information on the Negro in the United States. Such matters as the cases of Negroes against state educational institutions, their place in labor unions, fair employment practice legislation, and cultural achievements are dealt with in brief summary. The handbook is a useful factual reference work, with no attempt made to evaluate or to analyze the information contained in it.

"Human behavior falls into recognizable patterns, patterns which are persistent but at the same time subject to change. History is the study of these patterns and changes" (p. v). This concept of history is the framework about which Ralph Volney Harlow constructs his survey of *The United States: From*

*Wilderness to World Power* (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1949, pp. x, 854, maps, illustrations, selected readings, \$5.50). Many physical qualities which make for easy reading have their place in this well-made textbook. The type is highly legible, paragraphs are short, chapters are divided into sections by headings in the body, and these sections are in turn divided by marginal subtitles.

The first *Bulletin* of the Margaret I. King Library of the University of Kentucky (Lexington, 1949, pp. 16) contains a printed copy of Henry Clay's last will, with an introduction by Clement Eaton, and a six-page listing of "Writings on Kentucky History, 1948," compiled by Jacqueline Bull and Frances L. S. Dugan.

*The Process of Government* (Lexington, University of Kentucky Bureau of Government Research, 1949, pp. 63) consists of four lectures given at the University of Kentucky in 1947-1948 on the judicial, legislative, and administrative functions. The lectures were delivered by Simeon S. Willis, former governor of Kentucky, Mac Swinford, judge of a Federal district court in the state, Alben W. Barkley, then in the United States Senate, and Wilson W. Wyatt, former mayor of Louisville.

#### ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"The Founding of St. John's College, 1784-1789," by Tench Francis Tilghman, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).

"Some New Light on the Early Years of the Baltimore Plantation," by L. Leon Bernard, *ibid.*

"The Observatory on Federal Hill," by M. V. Brewington, *ibid.*

"Daniel Raymond, Esquire: Founder of American Economic Thought," by Charles J. MacGarvey, *ibid.*

"The Case Against the King: The *Virginia Gazette* Indict George III," by Stella F. Duff, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (July).

"Who Was Bartholomew Gosnold?" by Warner G. Gookin, *ibid.*

"Land Processioning in Colonial Virginia," by William H. Seiler, *ibid.*

"William Strachey, the Virginia Colony, and Shakespeare," by Charles Richard Sanders, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).

"Yorktown During the Revolution," by Edward M. Riley, *ibid.* (April and July).

"George Percy at Jamestown, 1607-1612," by John W. Shirley, *ibid.* (July).

"The Fire Problem in Colonial Virginia," by John B. Clark, Jr., *ibid.*

"The Old Town of Cobham," by A. W. Bohannon, *ibid.*

"Kentuckians at William and Mary College before 1861 with a Sketch of the College before that Date," by E. G. Swem, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).

"John Hammon: Revolutionary Soldier and Kentucky Pioneer," by Stratton O. Hammon, *ibid.*

"Robert P. Letcher's Appointment as Minister to Mexico," by W. D. Gilliam, Jr., in the *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* (April).

"Women Teachers in Oklahoma, 1820-1860," by Ethel McMillan, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Spring).

"Presbyterian Mission Schools Among the Choctaws and Chickasaws, 1845-1861," by William L. Hiemstra, *ibid.*

"Lewis Francis Hadley: 'The Long-Haired Sign Talker,'" by Carolyn Thomas Foreman, *ibid.*

"Experiences at the Opening of Oklahoma, 1889," by Robe Carl White, *ibid.*

"The Evening and the Morning Star," by Loy Otis Banks, in *Missouri Historical Review* (July).

"Gottfried Duden Views Missouri, 1824-1827," Part I, by Alice H. Finckh, *ibid.*

"The Development and Later Decline of the Hemp Industry in Missouri," by Miles W. Eaton, *ibid.*

"John Russell: 'Lord John' of Charleston," by Madeleine B. Stern, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"The Gourd in Southern History," by Eddie W. Wilson, *ibid.*

"The Food and Drink Shortage on the Confederate Homefront," by Mary Elizabeth Massey, *ibid.*

#### DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS OF THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Sharpe's Confidential Report on Maryland, 1765," edited by Aubrey C. Land, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).

"Letters of a Frederick County Forty-Niner," *ibid.*

"Journey Through the Wilderness," by Marshall W. Fishwick, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).

"Arlington and Mount Vernon, 1856: As Described in a Letter of Blanche Berard," by Clayton Torrence, *ibid.*

"Beyond the Strife, the Correspondence of George C. Stedman and William Torrey Harris," by Kurt F. Leidecker, in the *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* (April and July).

"An Unpublished Rafinesque Letter," by P. Albert Davies, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).

"The Campaign of Promise and Disappointment," edited by Edmund J. Cleveland, Jr., in the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* (July).

"The Diary of Joseph Gales, 1794-1795," edited by William S. Powell, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"The Missouri Reader: The Fur Trade," edited by Ada Paris Klein, in *Missouri Historical Review* (July).



## ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"William Bacon Stevens: Physician, Historian, Teacher, Preacher," by E. Merton Coulter, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).

"Reminiscences of Life in Georgia During the 1850s and 1860s," by Mrs. Myrtie Long Candler, *ibid.*

"Major-General John Campbell in British West Florida," by George C. Osborn, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).

"Nocoroco, a Timucua Village of 1605," by John W. Griffin and Hale G. Smith, *ibid.*

"The Founder of the Seminole Nation," by Kenneth W. Porter, *ibid.*

"The Political Activity of the Freedman's Bureau in Florida," by George R. Bentley, *ibid.* (July).

"Blount Springs: Alabama's Foremost Watering Place of Yesteryear," by James F. Sulzby, Jr., in the *Alabama Review* (July).

"Early Agricultural Demonstration Work in Alabama," by Charles S. Davis, *ibid.*

"The Confederate Convention: The Constitutional Debate," by Albert N. Fitts, *ibid.*

"Stands and Travel Accommodations on the Natchez Trace," by Dawson A. Phelps, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).

"The Beginnings of Jackson County," by Richard A. and Nannie P. McLemore, *ibid.*

"The Planters Society in Claiborne County: the First Incorporated Cooperative and First Farmers' Purchasing Cooperative," by William B. Hamilton, *ibid.*

"Selecting a Governor for the Territory of Orleans," by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April, 1948 [published June, 1949]).

"Literary Travellers in Louisiana between 1803 and 1860," by Florence Roos Brink, *ibid.*

"The Establishment of the Electric Telegraph in Louisiana and Mississippi," by Eleanor Beatrice Carleton, *ibid.*

"The Career of Paul Octave Hebert, Governor of Louisiana, 1853-1856," by Albert Leonce Dupont, *ibid.*

"Ethical Precepts among the Natchez Indians," by Andrew C. Albrecht, *ibid.* (July, 1948).

"The Role of the Baron de Bastrop in the Anglo-American Settlement of the Spanish Southwest," by R. Woods Moore, *ibid.*

"Five Early Louisiana Impeachments," by Cortez A. M. Ewing, *ibid.*

"The Louisiana Press and the Lottery," by Richard H. Wiggins, *ibid.*

"Arkansas and the Cherokees," by Edward E. Dale, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Summer).

"An Analysis of Arkansas' Population by Race and Nativity, and Residence," by John B. Mitchell, *ibid.*

"Glimpses of an Old Southwestern Town," by Ted R. Worley, *ibid.*

"Some Queries Concerning the Texas-Louisiana Sabine Boundary," by Bunyan H. Andrew, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).

"The Claim of Texas to Greer County," by Berlin C. Chapman, *ibid.*

"Texas Congressional Leaders and the New Freedom, 1913-1917," by Dewey W. Grantham, *ibid.*

"Early Libraries in Pendleton," by Frances Lander Spain, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

#### DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"199 Years of Augusta's Library: A Chronology," by Berry Fleming, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).

"A Connecticut Yankee after Olustee: Letters from the Front," by Vaughn D. Bornet, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).

"Diego Peña's Expedition to Apalachee and Apalachicola in 1716," translated and edited by Mark F. Boyd, *ibid.* (July).

"Letters of the Invaders of East Florida, 1812," edited by Rembert W. Patrick, *ibid.*

"Francis P. Fleming in the War for Southern Independence: Letters from the Front," edited by Edward C. Williamson, *ibid.*

"The Autobiography of William John Grayson," continued, edited by Samuel Gaillard Stoney, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"Letters and Will of Robert Pringle (1702-1776)," continued, edited by Mary Pringle Fenhagen, *ibid.*

#### GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

"The Mississippi: Valley of Decision," by Dwight L. Dumond, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).

"Who Wrote the Allison Letters: A Study in Historical Detection," by Joseph G. Raybank, *ibid.*

"George W. Cable and Negro Education," by Philip Butcher, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).

"Importance of Records in the National Archives on the History of the Negro," by Roland C. McConnell, *ibid.*

"Negroes in Colorado," by James R. Harvey, in the *Colorado Magazine* (July).

"Zebulon Montgomery Pike's Mississippi Voyage, 1805-1806," by W. E. Hollon, in *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (June).

### CONTRIBUTORS

CHARLES M. WILTSE, whose second volume of a projected three-volume biography of Calhoun was recently published, lives in Washington, D. C.

WALTER B. POSEY is professor of history in Agnes Scott College and in Emory University.

EUGENE CURRENT-GARCÍA is associate professor of English in the Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

GILBERT C. FITE is associate professor of history in the University of Oklahoma.

HOWARD R. MARRARO is associate professor of Italian in Columbia University.